71/29
c

The Bancroft Library

University of California • Berkeley

71/29
C

University of California
Regional Oral History Office
Bancroft Library/Berkeley

Ruth Norton Donnelly

THE UNIVERSITY'S ROLE IN HOUSING SERVICES

With an Introduction by

Margaret O. Dewell

An Interview Conducted by

Harriet Nathan

© 1970 by The University of California at Berkeley

All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between the Regents of the University of California and Ruth Norton Donnelly, dated February 24, 1970. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to Ruth Norton Donnelly until January 1, 1975. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Director of The Bancroft Library of the University of California.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to the Regional Oral History Office, 486 Library, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user. The legal agreement with Ruth Norton Donnelly requires that she be notified of the request and allowed thirty days in which to respond.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Preface	i
	Introduction	iv
	Interview History	viii
I	EARLY CHOICE AND FAMILY VIEWS	1
II	UNIVERSITY EDUCATION--BERKELEY STYLE	4
	Student Activities, Publications, and Learning to Write	4
	Learning to Live Within a Group	13
	The Question of Continuity	17
III	POST-GRADUATE LIFE AND CAMPUS TIES	23
	A Taste of Teaching	23
	Advertising and Marriage	24
	Education of a Traveling Secretary	26
	Honor Students and Phi Beta Kappa	28
IV	A TEMPORARY JOB IN THE DEAN OF WOMEN'S OFFICE, 1942	31
	Speeches and Technique	31
	Executives and In-Service Training	33
	On Being Firm and Fair	36
	Inspecting and Advising	39
V	SUPERVISOR OF HOUSING SERVICES, 1946	47
	The Break-Through: Fernwald 30-Day Wonders of 1945	51
	Comparative Costs of Building	58
	Housing for Older Students	60
	Comments on Student Unrest, December, 1966	64
	Albany and Richmond Villages	67
	The Case of Married Students	69
VI	STUDENT HOUSING ADMINISTRATION: STAFF HOUSING INCLUDED	72
	Inspecting Fraternities	75
	Cooperating With City Inspectors	75
	Faculty Wives and Foreign Student Housing	76
	Financing Residence Halls: University-Wide	79
	The Controversial 9-Story Residence Halls	84
	The Student Housing Administration	87
VII	REORGANIZATION--A NEW PLAN	89
	Some Old Issues	92
	A New Approach: Co-ed Halls	94
	Manville Hall	96
VIII	DEAN, UNIVERSITY HOUSING, AND THE VIEW FROM SEPTEMBER, 1969	103
	Nine-story Halls: An Evaluation	104
	Mistakes Made For the Planning Committee	106
	Proposals for Apartments	107
	Problems of Debt Allocation	108

Manville Hall Revisited 110
Unit 2 and the "People's Park" 115
Plans to Increase Student Control 116
Laws and a Lack of Facts 120
Big Business and Too Many Experts 122

APPENDIX 127

University History Series

PREFACE

Under a grant from the University of California Alumni Foundation, the Regional Oral History Office has been conducting a series of interviews with persons who have made a significant contribution to the development of the University of California at Berkeley. A list of University History interviews follows, including an earlier group which had been conducted in cooperation with the Centennial History Project, directed by Professor Walton E. Bean. The Alumni Foundation grant made it possible to continue this University-centered series, of which this manuscript is a part.

The University History interviews have benefited greatly from the expert advice and assistance of Richard E. Erickson, Executive Manager of the Alumni Association; Arthur M. Arlett, Intercollegiate Athletic Coordinator for Alumni and Public Relations; and Verne A. Stadtman, Centennial Editor.

The Regional Oral History Office was established to tape record autobiographical interviews with persons prominent in recent California history. The Office is under the administrative supervision of the Director of the Bancroft Library.

Willa Baum
Head, Regional Oral
History Office

15 July 1968
Regional Oral History Office
Room 486 The Bancroft Library
University of California
Berkeley, California

Interviews in the University History Series which have been completed by the Regional Oral History Office.

SERIES I

Birge, Raymond Thayer	Raymond Thayer Birge, Physicist. 1960
Chaney, Ralph Works	Ralph Works Chaney, Ph.D., Paleobotanist, Conservationist. 1960
Hutchison, Claude B.	The College of Agriculture, University of California, 1922-1952. 1962
Lessing, Ferdinand D.	Early Years. 1963
Lenzen, Victor F.	Physics and Philosophy. 1965
Merritt, Ralph P.	After Me Cometh a Builder, the Recollections of Ralph Palmer Merritt. 1962
Meyer, Karl F.	Medical Research and Public Health. In process.
Mitchell, Lucy Sprague	Pioneering in Education. 1962
Olney, Mary McLean	Oakland, Berkeley, and the University of California, 1880-1895. 1963
Neuhaus, Eugen	Reminiscences: Bay Area Art and the University of California Art Department. 1961
Neylan, John Francis	Politics, Law, and the University of California. 1962
Pepper, Stephen C.	Art and Philosophy at the University of California, 1919 to 1962. 1963
Porter, Robert Langley	Robert Langley Porter, Physician, Teacher, and Guardian of the Public Health. 1960
Richardson, Leon J.	Berkeley Culture, University of California Highlights, and University Extension, 1892-1960. 1962
Shields, Peter J.	Reminiscences. 1954
Sproul, Ida Wittschen	Duty, Devotion and Delight in the President's House, University of California. 1961
Stevens, Frank C.	Forty Years in the Office of the President, University of California, 1905-1945. 1959
Treadway, Walter	Correspondence and Papers on Langley Porter Clinic. (Bound into Langley Porter interview.)

Waring, Henry C. — Henry C. Waring on University Extension. 1960

Woods, Baldwin M. — University of California Extension. 1957

Wurster, William Wilson — College of Environmental Design, University of California, Campus Planning, and Architectural Practice. 1964

SERIES II

Interviews fully or partially funded by the University of California Alumni Foundation.

Blaisdell, Allen C. — Foreign Students and the Berkeley International House, 1928-1961. 1968

Corley, James V. — Serving the University in Sacramento. 1969

Cross, Ira Brown — Portrait of an Economics Professor. 1967

Cruess, William V. — A Half Century in Food and Wine Technology. 1967

Davidson, Mary Blossom — The Dean of Women and the Importance of Students. 1967

Dennes, William R. — Philosophy and the University Since 1915. 1970

Donnelly, Ruth — The University's Role in Housing Services. 1970

Ebright, Carroll "Ky" — California Varsity and Olympics Crew Coach. 1968

Evans, Clinton W. — California Athlete, Coach, Administrator, Ambassador. 1968

Hamilton, Brutus — Student Athletics and the Voluntary Discipline. 1967

Hays, William Charles — Order, Taste, and Grace in Architecture. 1968

Johnston, Marguerite Kulp and Mixer, Joseph R. — Student Housing, Welfare, and the ASUC. 1970

Lehman, Benjamin H. — Recollections and Reminiscences of Life in the Bay Area from 1920 Onward. 1969

Towle, Katherine A. — Administration and Leadership. 1970

Underhill, Robert M. — University of California Lands, Finances, and Investment. 1968

Wessels, Glenn A. — Education of an Artist. 1967

Witter, Jean C. — The University, the Community, and the Lifeblood of Business. 1968

INTRODUCTION

To be reared in the beautiful Napa Valley, a second generation Californian, may have enormous influence in developing a personality. There was a generation that lived at a more leisurely pace, when overcrowding, disordered ecology, racial tensions, high taxation, nuclear threats, and all the burdens of today's world were not yet oppressive. Part of Ruth Norton's early life was spent five miles from town, among oak trees, or in the family orchard with five acres of fruit trees and table grapes (in a wine growing valley, her father grew table grapes); the rest of her time was spent in town where no one was really rich and no one was really poor. It was a leisurely, orderly life, and one that made for a delightful childhood in which the little things were the important ones.

She and her brother Dan attended the University of California at Berkeley when it was large but not huge, in comparison with other universities at that time. There were twelve thousand students and twenty-five hundred in her graduating class, so that Commencement even then was held in the stadium. But everyone, faculty, students and administrators, worked hard to make the campus informal and friendly. In relation to the population of the state, the University at Berkeley was proportionately bigger than it is now. Ruth Norton gave to it the kind of "faith, service, and loyalty" that was honored by membership in Prytanean and Mortar Board honor societies. In 1925, she was a charter member of the Berkeley chapter of Mortar Board. Through her sorority, Sigma Kappa, she was given a home on campus, and the warmth of sisterhood. This she returned manyfold by her devotion as an alumna. She served as Chairman of the Advisors Board, President of the Corporation Board, and finally, for two years, as the first traveling secretary. She even ran a national convention.

She was an English major, but it was journalism and the Daily Californian that captured her interest. She became a Junior Editor in the days when the junior editorial board put out the paper. In campus governance, she

participated in the work of many committees and other activities such as the Blue and Gold, where she was an editor for two years. Her membership on the Women's Student Affairs Committee (the sole campus disciplinary body for women at the time) in her senior year was the high point of her college career.

After graduation, a teaching stint and a job in advertising, she was married in 1932. She and her husband Don took up their Berkeley residence near the campus, in an apartment in a brown shingle building that was subsequently torn down so that Putnam Hall could be built on the site. The Donnellys later moved to the north side where they have lived ever since.

For the next few years, she kept house, studied for another year, and then engaged in volunteer work and teaching. In 1940, she became assistant to the secretary of Phi Beta Kappa and secretary of the Honor Students. Two years later, she was invited by Dean Mary Davidson to become her assistant in the office of the Dean of Women, where Ruth learned about deaning, and in particular about problems of housing. The focus on student housing started with concern about women students and where they lived. As the campus grew, there was increasing concern about finding suitable accommodations for the young women so that they could be supervised, properly fed, and safely housed.

When the Student Housing Administration was established in 1946, Ruth Donnelly became the first Supervisor of Housing. Her offices were in the file room of the Dean of Women's office.

The trail of students into 201 Sproul Hall so clogged the hallways that the President and Vice-president could not get into their own offices. A quonset hut was set down where the Pelican Building is now located. The hut was a housing office, a first for Berkeley, and Ruth Donnelly was in charge. The tin building flooded when Strawberry Creek overflowed, and instead of standard see-through windows, had windows of wired plastic, but it too became a very busy place. The original two employees grew to twelve as the office

responsibilities expanded.

The design for the student service office was hers. First, it was to be a place where students were welcome, could always talk with someone and find helpful advice. There were rental listings, lists of housing inspected and "approved" by the University, maps and brochures, and as married student housing became available in Albany, a desk to help married students find a place to live. Everyone in the office "lived in each other's pockets" in those days, and when President Robert Gordon Sproul walked in the door, they almost stood at attention. When applications were available for the first few residence halls, students slept on the lawns so as to be first in the line that stretched across the field by Hearst gym and over to Bancroft Way.

The office staff soon learned manners, grammar and usage, sometimes painfully. A new employee who was to send dozens of telegrams (not wires) to families moving into University housing, learned not to write, "Please contact the housing office." "Contact" remained a noun. An inspection report that referred to "drapes" was rewritten so as to refer to "draperies." One year when Ruth Donnelly edited speeches presented at a national housing meeting, the office was delighted to learn that a gentleman full of educationist lingo had said "it was unavoidably and inescapably self-evident" eight times in one speech. There was a busy blue pencil! In 1970, however, Ruth Donnelly, purist, was heard to say "you know" four times in one day, so it appears that even she couldn't forever resist such corrupting influences.

Memberships in professional groups were peripheral to the demands of the busy Housing Office. The Association of College and University Housing Officers was begun at an informal meeting in 1949, and she was part of the early planning in this group that has since grown to international status. For many years, she was Secretary-Treasurer and attended all of the national meetings, forming friendships with housing officers across the land, as well as becoming their "expert" advisor. As an offshoot of the national group, the California Association was developed; she was vice-president in 1956-1957 and their first (and so far their only) woman president in 1966-1967.

Ruth Donnelly was a member of both the national and California deans' organizations. The groups keep changing their names, but represent women high school, junior college, and university deans. She has been chairman of the Northern Region in the California Association of Women Deans and Vice Principals as well as holding various other offices as a member of the Executive Board. In 1969, she was honored with a citation for twenty-five years of service to the group.

Advising student campus organizations such as Panile, Prytanean, Mortar Board, Theta Sigma Phi, and Torch and Shield has been an activity dear to her heart. That young people honor the traditions of these groups and realize the privileges of membership has been both an interest and a cause. It has also been a joy.

Ruth and Don live in the Berkeley hills near the campus. The trek to campus by day or night, to office or meeting, to quonset hut or to a pleasant new office, has been uninterrupted. You don't measure hours when you work with students. You treasure friendships, respond to wit and intelligence, savor confidences, rejoice in exchanging ideas, and you feel that being part of the Berkeley scene through thick and thin is a career well spent. Listen now to the reminiscences of those years at Berkeley. They come from one who cares very much about this University and has served it with honor.

Margaret O. Dewell
Supervisor of Housing Services

17 March 1970
Housing Office
University of California
Berkeley, California

INTERVIEW HISTORY

The memoirs of Ruth Norton Donnelly, Associate Dean, University Housing Services, are part of the University History Series supported by the Alumni Foundation.

Interviewer: Harriet Nathan

Dates of Interviews:

December 1, 1966
December 8, 1966
December 29, 1966
September 17, 1969

Location: Mrs. Donnelly and the University Housing Office occupied two different locations during the years when her interviews were being recorded. The first three, the 1966 interviews, were held in her old office at 2620 Bancroft Way in a white wooden porticoed building that had once served as a fraternity house. It was subsequently demolished to make room for the University Art Gallery. By the time of the fourth interview, in 1969, Mrs. Donnelly and the Housing Office had moved to new quarters in a one-story building at 2405 Bowditch.

The extended time-table was caused by a combination of factors including the University's first venture into the quarter system, student unrest, the departure of University President Clark Kerr, and a spell when Mrs. Donnelly had to endure an uncharacteristic period of rest to allow a broken bone to mend. The delay did, however, bring distinctive benefits in the form of time perspective and the chance for the memoirist to draw together threads that had necessarily been left dangling from the earlier portion of the series.

Interviews were conducted in one and a half hour sessions at Mrs. Donnelly's desk, and through the open door could be heard the steady buzz and clatter of students and staff members trying to solve perpetual housing problems. Known in the campus and the community as a popular and witty public speaker, Mrs. Donnelly was equally at ease in the conversational interview style. She handled the most searching questions with fluency, command of the material, wry humor, and an ability to produce perfectly constructed sentences. Thus when the transcribed interviews were submitted to her for review and approval, only minor editing was required.

Harriet Nathan
Interviewer

12 June 1970
Regional Oral History Office
486 The Bancroft Library
University of California at Berkeley

I EARLY CHOICE AND FAMILY VIEWS

Nathan: Shall we begin with your original determination to go to college? How did you decide which one to go to?

Donnelly: I think that the determination of whether or not I should go to college was made by my parents, because I grew up knowing that I was going to go on to college. This was partly a result of the fact that both of them had started college, one at what is now the University of the Pacific (it was then the Napa College) and the other at Stanford; my father at the former, my mother at the latter. Both had had to stop; my father in order to take a job, my mother to help my grandmother support her family. So I think Father and Mother simply took for granted that my brother and I would go to college.

Nathan: What were your parents' names?

Donnelly: Norton. Lewis John and Catherine, and her maiden name was Skinner.

Skinner is a good Manx name.

Nathan: Manx?

Donnelly: Yes. My two grandfathers came to California in the gold rush days; one from the Isle of Man, and one from New York State. They settled in the West and reared their families here. Higher education was important to both of my grandfathers, and also to my parents. My brother and I discussed this; he said that it never occurred to him that he wasn't going to college, the only question was where he was going to go to college. Everything we took in grammar school; everything we took in high school; was related to our being prepared to go to college. Most of our friends' families were reacting this

Donnelly: way, too. I realized, when I came to college that this was unusual, particularly then. But, it was taken for granted as far as we were concerned.

My determination to come to the University of California was probably no more intelligent than the decisions that most entering students make. I went to Napa High School and then to Berkeley High School, so I grew up hearing about the University of California at Berkeley.

My mother wanted me to go East to a girls' school. My father wanted me to go to a good Methodist college. This was talked about all the time I was in high school, so that I had a good deal of exposure to both the Eastern women's colleges and also to the two Methodist institutions; what is now the University of the Pacific, and the University of Southern California.

But I wanted to go to a bigger institution, and I also wanted to go to a public institution. I think this probably is because I was educated in public schools, because my parents had discussed my going to the Anna Head School, which my mother wanted very much for me to do; and we had agreed that I could go to Berkeley High School instead. And I wanted to go to a co-educational school, but both USC and College of the Pacific were co-educational.

Now that you've asked me, I've wondered myself what my reasons were and why I thought it was so important. I wanted to go to an institution larger than either the College of the Pacific or USC, this I know. I wanted to come here, particularly. I didn't want to go to a girls' college or a girls' school; whether rightly or wrongly.

I wanted to come here, I think, because of my experience in the Napa High School, which was a smaller school than the Berkeley High School. The competition at Berkeley High School, even in those days,

Donnelly: was greater than it was at Napa; I discovered that I had to work at Berkeley High School. I suppose this helped, knowing that I was lazy, to make me feel I should go someplace where the competition would be tough. But there was no anguish about making up my mind about going to college.

Nathan: This should put you in some sort of sympathy with the other people who come to Berkeley sometimes not knowing why, but knowing they want to come.

Donnelly: It does make me sympathetic, for I had to do a great deal of arguing before I got here.

Nathan: Was your brother here before you?

Donnelly: No. He came after me. So I think Dan had a little easier time in establishing the fact that he should go to the University, because by that time my father had decided that, while he didn't agree on the whole with the approach of the University, it seemed not to have done me any major harm. So he decided it would be all right for my brother.

I'm sure that my father, who lived to see us both grow up, came to the conclusion that we were right, and that it was a good decision. Neither my brother nor I had to support ourselves during college, so we were not making any contribution financially even though we were being mighty stubborn about where we wanted to go to college.

II UNIVERSITY EDUCATION--BERKELEY STYLE

Nathan: You immediately got involved in activities? Is this something that you had thought ahead that you would like to do?

Donnelly: No. I think that there were just a great many things to do. This was one of the reasons that I wanted to come to the University; there were so many things to do and they all were so interesting. My working on the Daily Californian, I suppose, came because I was convinced, as are most of the young who are interested in writing, about which I knew very little and thought I knew a great deal, that this was a logical way to get more experience.

Actually, I learned more about writing by working on the Daily Californian for three years than I could ever have learned in classes. But then it was very different, with a large staff, which continued (those who did not get cut) for several years. It is very different now when they seem to hold on to people who are not even up to their present standards, because they have nobody else to get the story. This was not true when I was in college.

Student Activities, Publications, and Learning to Write

Nathan: You started as a freshman on the staff?

Donnelly: I started as a freshman. The staff was set up very differently then, with a women's editor, and an editor, and a men's staff, and a women's staff, and a junior editorial staff which did all the things which the senior editorial staff does now, because the only seniors on the paper were the editor, the women's editor, the sports editor, and the assistant editor. There were not more than five seniors on the staff.

Nathan: Possibly a managing editor?

Donnelly: I think there was a manager; there may have been a managing editor. But the assistant editor was really the managing editor. So you worked as a freshman, and if you weren't cut you worked as a sophomore, and then when you were a junior editor you did the things which the senior editorial staff now does: you wrote editorials, you made up the paper, assigned the stories, and did all of the other things involved in putting out a paper. I think all of the other activities that I got engaged in came as a result of working on the Daily Californian.

Nathan: Well, very likely Prytanean and Mortar Board did. Is it a bit unusual to be on both the Daily Californian and the Blue and Gold at the same time?

Donnelly: Well, not in those days--in my time the junior class put out the Blue and Gold. This was a class project, so anybody who had any knowledge of anything that had to do with writing or editing worked on the Blue and Gold.

Nathan: That accounts for the fact that it always seems to be the wrong year in those early issues.

Donnelly: Yes. I worked on it two years because it was when I was a junior that it became an ASUC activity instead of a junior class activity. So of those of us who worked on it as juniors, many worked on it again as seniors. This was the only time in history when one class worked two years in sequence on it.

Prior to that it had been a class activity with the class supporting it. If the editor or manager made any money, they could keep it. The book had to be paid for, but it was a junior class activity, so we were very careful to be sure that it at least broke even. There was no ASUC support.

Donnelly: When the constitution of the ASUC was revised, this was changed. It was when I was a junior that we revised the ASUC constitution, we thought for all time. It's been revised or rewritten, I think, 15 times since.

Nathan: This was about 1925?

Donnelly: It was in '24, when I was a junior, that we rewrote the ASUC constitution, and the Blue and Gold became part of the ASUC and then the editor and the manager got paid, as they do now.

Nathan: Was the Daily Cal part of the ASUC at that time?

Donnelly: Oh, yes. We kept fighting with the executive committee, for different reasons from the reasons they fight about now, but this is a built-in quarrel, I think. It had been part of the ASUC for a long time.

My other activities, of varying sorts, were a result of these interests. I wasn't on the Daily Californian when I was a senior, because I served on the Student Affairs Committee, which was the judicial committee that handled all discipline matters. We did not have, as we have now, a faculty Committee on Student Conduct (I always have trouble with its name). Then we had a Men's Student Affairs Committee and a Women's Student Affairs Committee; the two met together if there was a case that involved both men and women.

Nathan: Were they not later called judicial committees?

Donnelly: Oh, yes, the Student Affairs Committee's name was changed to the Judicial Committee. It's too bad, I think. All discipline cases, except for a few that were either automatically handled by the deans or referred to them by the committee, were handled by the students.

Nathan: What sorts of problems did you deal with?

Donnelly: Everything. Cheating. . .we handled all academic cheating cases. Stealing. . .and all the other things you can think of. We took our responsibility very seriously. But then we lived under the Honor System, so that the students were taking responsibility for their own conduct. We all felt very strongly that this was important. That took a great deal of my time when I was a senior.

I was a charter member of Mortar Board. Mortar Board wanted a group, or a chapter, at the University of California at Berkeley. The officers of Mortar Board talked to those of us who went to other national conventions, sorority and student government conventions, about what a good idea it would be to have one. The group that petitioned Mortar Board on this campus was made up of a group of members of Prytanean formed for the purpose of petitioning Mortar Board.

We discussed it with Miss Stebbins and Mrs. Davidson, and decided that there was a place on this campus for both a junior-senior honor society, and a senior honor society. Mortar Board had a rule that it couldn't go on a campus where there was a junior-senior honor society, so we said that was fine, we really didn't need Mortar Board anyway when they said that Prytanean would have to become just a junior honor society. But all of us were members of Prytanean.

Mortar Board wished to come on this campus. So it did, and Prytanean remained as a junior-senior honor society.

Nathan: And was Theta Sigma Phi [the journalism honor society for women] already on the campus?

Donnelly: Yes, and it had been here I don't know how long. It was founded nationally in 1918. I suppose it's in the archives somewhere: possibly in the records that I have in this office.

Nathan: Well, thinking again of some of your publications activities, do you remember any students or advisors particularly well?

Donnelly: I could make (and have made) a speech on Charlie Raymond, who was the advisor to all of us on all the publications, because he's one of the people who helped us develop whatever talents we had and also instilled in us his own rigid code of journalistic ethics. Charlie Raymond, who had been a reporter on several newspapers, was a professor of English who thought it was important to have a School of Journalism on the campus, and fought for it all the time he was teaching English. And he convinced all of us so we fought for it and Eshleman Hall, too.

He was the official and unofficial advisor of not only all the people on the Daily Californian but also of a great many other students who met him through various publications. He was a very important person.

I'm trying to think about what seemed to me to make Charlie Raymond so ideal an advisor. There were many things, but I think the most important is that you never had any question about where he stood; it was all perfectly clear, and yet you always had an option to disagree with him and go ahead and do as you wished to do. And you didn't have the nagging fear that he would be mad at you.

You thought he would be grieved when the consequences of your action, which he had warned you of, resulted, but you had no feeling he would be mad. After a while you realized he might think you weren't quite as smart as he'd thought you were, but that he was not going to be critical. You were perfectly sure that if your cause was just he'd fight for you, and that if your cause was not just he would probably keep his mouth shut, even though he'd warned you.

Now, there are a dozen things that go into being a good advisor: you have to be able to listen, you have to know when to advise and when not to, and you have to be sure you know what you're doing, to mention only a few. But the vital thing, I think, is the thing that Charlie had. He was no saint, and I don't mean to make him a

Donnelly: saint. But he had an abiding and tremendous interest in you and a concern for you, and you knew it. But he wasn't about to solve your problems for you.

When an editor of the Daily Californian planned to write an editorial which was very controversial, Charlie never said he shouldn't, or she shouldn't. He simply pointed out what the results would be; if you wrote it this might happen, and that might happen. If he really thought you were wrong, he usually said, "Well, now, let me tell you, if you get into trouble don't come to me, because I'm not going to help you out of it." And he meant it. He would be sympathetic and listen, but he didn't go all out as he did if he thought you had backed into something which you hadn't known about. It gave you a tremendous sense of your responsibility for your actions.

Nathan: What were some of the big issues the Daily Cal editors were concerned about then?

Donnelly: The building of the stadium. The revision of the ASUC constitution. The actions of the executive committee. And dozens of other, to us, vital issues.

Nathan: Were they pro or con?

Donnelly: Well, to understand my concern with the Californian now, you would have to know that actually there was much less pro and con than there was inquiry into what was going on. We took editorial positions, but they were usually on campus matters, not off-campus matters, so they usually had to do with what we thought about what was going on on campus.

It was during my junior year, I think, that the Legislature was investigating us. They weren't going to give us all the money the

Donnelly: University needed, so the members came to spend a day on the campus; the students took them around and tried to make them think we were lovely people, not irresponsible students!

While we took editorial positions on things that we thought affected the University, we were not affected then, really, by the outside world, nor were we very interested in it; we were interested in our own problems. Now, whether this was good or bad, I don't know, but this makes a real difference between the Californian of those days and the Californian of today.

Also, we had a feeling, supported by Charlie, that we were obliged to cover the campus, because in addition to everything else we were a house organ. This didn't mean that we had to agree with the ASUC executive committee, which is what we called it, or that we had to approve of what they did, and we were often very critical of what they did and they were usually very mad at us. It did mean, however, that our preoccupation was with the things that seemed to us related to the University. You can get into plenty of controversies right there. These were our main concerns.

I suspect that Charlie was not popular with most of his academic colleagues because he was not really an academician and a "scholar." He came to us from a newspaper; he'd been a working journalist. He was an excellent teacher. He is the man who taught me what was wrong with my knowledge of grammar.

Nathan: You were an English major?

Donnelly: Yes. He is the one person who convinced me that it was nice that I'd thought I was going to be the great American writer, but that I would have to learn how to use the English language first. He did it in a variety of both subtle and obvious ways. He corrected papers with great care and with reasonable kindness, with a successful kind

Donnelly: of sarcastic comment on the involved sentence. He told me that if I had one more clause in my life, I never would be able to shut my mouth and finish the paper. A perfect description. This seemed to both of us terribly humorous, and we laughed like mad; I got the point, and from then on my sentences didn't take up whole pages. This is the kind of thing which he did with grace, because you thought he really cared about you.

My favorite story about his correcting my papers concerned one of my bad habits. Because I had been reared in a good Methodist family, I had been taught that profanity was not acceptable. I had a very bad habit of using the word "darn," so Charlie wrote on one of my papers, "I don't know whether this is just because you don't know what other word to use, or whether it's because you haven't anything else to say, or whether you mean 'damn.' If you mean 'damn,' say it. If you don't mean 'damn,' find a word that is a word." None of these things made you feel that you ought to go up and burst into tears, because you knew him well enough and he knew you well enough. Really, he and T. K. Whipple are the persons who taught me what sentence structure was.

I came to the University determined to major in English. I failed Subject A, so I had to take what was then known as English IX. In those days the professors, not teaching assistants, taught the course. And Mr. Whipple (who died far too young), who wrote as beautifully as he taught, was the man who gave the course which I took in English IX. He and Charlie helped me to discover that my high school English teachers had been more kind than just. I had a great deal to learn and they convinced me that it was worth it.

The other friendly mentor I remember with affection is Chauncey Wells. He was my advisor all the time that I was an English major. And while sometimes Mr. Wells made me long speeches, (everybody called him Chauncey, by the way, behind his back, and nobody would have

Donnelly: thought of calling him Chauncey to his face) he also advised me carefully and thoughtfully. He was a wonderful man with white hair and a goatee, who was an expert on the novel. In those days you had advisors for the whole period.

Nathan: The same for four years?

Donnelly: No, you had one for your lower division years and then an advisor in your department when you declared your major. I had a Major in the Army as my lower division advisor; he learned on me and I learned how to read a catalogue and how to get out of courses that he had unwisely persuaded me to take. I had no talent for science and he had a great love for it, so he kept getting me into science courses from which I had to retreat hurriedly. Anyway, he and I had a happy time. Major Underhill was his name.

The other person, who looked out for everyone, was Dean [Monroe] Deutsch, who was then Dean of the College of Letters and Science. He kept you to a proper academic standard but didn't think it was a sin if you had stupidly misread the catalogue and made a mistake. In fact, he helped you to resolve your problem, even if it involved an extension course or a few too many units. He had a very personal kind of relationship with the students. I'm constantly amazed at the alumni who have this feeling about Mr. Deutsch as Dean Deutsch.

By the way, it was Mrs. Deutsch who taught me that you never called anybody who had a Ph.D. "doctor." She corrected us all when we did it and explained to us why we shouldn't. I told her when I saw her at a tea not long ago that she had not prepared me for the world in which I now lived, because all the gentlemen who had either Ed.D.'s or Ph.D.'s liked to be called "doctor." And she said, "No, Ruth, just some of them."

Nathan: Were you at all aware of the Dean of Women's office? Were you connected with the deans then?

Donnelly: We were very aware of the dean's office. We all knew Miss Stebbins; we all knew Mrs. Davidson. We knew Mrs. Davidson better than we knew Miss Stebbins. However, when I was in my first year of graduate work, I was chairman of the Prytanean Fête, that lovely activity on which we used to make $1500 every year, so we never had any money problems. A graduate Prytanean was always chairman, while the undergraduates did all the work.

I got to know Miss Stebbins very well during that period because we had all kinds of ideas which she considered unacceptable for the theme of that year's Prytanean Fête. She had a real talent for making you aware, in her good New England fashion, without being unpleasant.

Then, of course, those of us on the Student Affairs Committee met with Miss Stebbins, because she was the person to whom we made our recommendations. Miss Stebbins took them to the President. So I knew Miss Stebbins when I was a student.

But we all knew Mrs. Davidson, and we went to see Mrs. Davidson about all our problems.

Learning to Live Within a Group

I encountered Mrs. Davidson when I was a freshman, when she inspected the house in which I lived and found my room was not up to her standard. The next time I met her, she reminded me that I didn't need to leave in such a hurry in the morning; I could get up five minutes earlier. She was quite right.

This was in my sorority house. I lived in College Hall for one semester; that was the privately operated dormitory that was on the corner of Hearst and La Loma, where the parking lot is now, next door to what was Newman Hall. Then I moved into my sorority and

Donnelly: lived in the sorority all the rest of the time I was an undergraduate.

By the way, most of the things I learned about getting along with people, what my faults and my virtues were, I learned in my sorority. It was my sorority which first encouraged me to make speeches by making me think that my first speech was very funny.

Nathan: This was Sigma Kappa, was it?

Donnelly: Yes.

Nathan: They laughed when you spoke, then?

Donnelly: They laughed when I spoke, and I decided that I was a great humorist, so I've made speeches ever since. It's really the fault of the sorority that I've gone on making speeches. Sororities were smaller then. Ours probably had not more than 50 members, of whom not more than 30 or 35 lived in the house. I'm not sure that the size they have now, 70 or 80, is any bigger in today's world than our group was. Everything about the world now is bigger; Berkeley was smaller then; the State of California was smaller.

I think we were no more high-minded, or noble, or dedicated to humanitarian purposes than most youngsters are between the ages of 18 and 22. Probably we were less. I understand our generation was frivolous. That always comes as a shock to me when I hear it, because I thought we were very serious.

But I think we learned more in living with each other than we could have learned any other way. To mention only a few: I learned to sleep with the light on, with the radio going, and with a card game going on in the room. I learned that I had a big voice, which I had to keep under control. And I must say that these have all been

Donnelly: invaluable. All this has made me a far more acceptable wife! The young now seem much less willing to learn. They complain about noise, etc., and I wonder if they are planning to live their lives in sound proofed cells, far from the noises of normal family living.

I'd always lived in a room by myself at home. I would not have found out how selfish I was and how far from perfect if I hadn't lived with a group of girls. I don't know a better way to find out these things than to live with a group of people who care about you.

I liked some of my sorority sisters very much, and I disliked others, and I'm sure they disliked me, but this didn't disrupt us. There were members who seemed to me incredibly stupid people, and I'm sure they felt that way about me. But I learned that I didn't have to love all of them, and yet living with them did, probably, more to help me grow up than any other experience I had. And they are certainly the people who encouraged me to do the things I did on the campus.

I'm not sure that sorority life is for everybody, but I'm sure that it was a good thing for me, and I'm sure it was a good thing for my brother to belong to a fraternity. There were only two of us growing up, and each of us had grown up to be quite selfish and quite determined to do things the way we wanted to do them. While we lived within the limits set by our parents, we would never have learned these things about other people if we hadn't lived in groups that were closely knit.

The sorority encouraged me. They told me the things I did that were stupid, but they also told me the things I did that were good. I discovered that I was not ever going to be the greatest cake-baker in the world, although I did learn to make sandwiches. But there were other things which I could do that were really quite acceptable. The group itself accepted the fact that no one person had all the

Donnelly: talents, but that no one was without any. I suppose the best friends I had, with a few exceptions, were outside of the sorority.

Nathan: Did you meet them through activities?

Donnelly: Activities, yes, and people I met. The sorority was like a family; you don't go every place with your family when you are growing up, and yet there was always the family to come home to. This was the advantage. And of course, I think this can be produced in any kind of living group, if the students want to make the effort.

Nathan: You are thinking, I suppose, of the dormitories, the residence halls?

Donnelly: Yes. Or any other kind of living group.

Nathan: Do you feel that the students manifest a desire for this kind of closeness?

Donnelly: They're human beings. I think they don't express it this way. I think they want it, because I think every human being does. The residence hall or the privately operated boarding house can do what the sorority did, and does, if the people in the hall make an effort. I'm not convinced that human beings have changed so much that they don't want a relationship to other people.

Everyone wants to be important, or to feel important, unless all the psychologists are wrong, and everyone wants to do something that's reasonably useful, something that other people think is good. We all want praise. Nobody wants to be told his faults, and yet most people accept the grim fact that they must have some. There are only a few people who don't think that they have any.

And I think the young are very much this way. I think they are a little reticent now because it's supposed to be corny and sentimental to express any of your feelings, but they still have them. I think we fail them when we don't encourage them to express their feelings.

Donnelly: And I mean privately, not loudly on the Sproul Hall steps.

Nathan: Do you feel that the resident assistants or the housemothers, or whoever is in some position of authority in the residence halls, can encourage this type of program?

Donnelly: Yes, this is why we have them.

Nathan: Do you encourage them to do so?

Donnelly: Yes, we do. And we also work with the student officers, trying to help them to do this encouraging of other students, because, of course, the upperclassmen did it when I was an undergraduate.

The Question of Continuity

The real problem that we have, and the real difference that I see in the living groups now, is that my generation accepted the fact that it had been done for us and we had an obligation to do it for somebody else. I don't think so many of our upperclassmen do now. Some of them do, because some of them realize what they learned as freshmen and sophomores because of the upperclassmen; they stay on in organized groups to do for the lowerclassmen what was done for them.

But I think every living group--sorority, fraternity, residence hall--has the problem now of the upperclassmen saying, "Well, this has been wonderful, and now I've learned all I can and now I want to go away and do other things." This is a normal feeling; we felt this way when we were seniors, certainly. But we were aware of the fact that we had a responsibility to stay and produce for other people what they had produced for us, and we weren't being noble. We were simply accepting an obligation and a responsibility.

Nathan: I think this feeling did show itself in the Daily Californian

Nathan: system, in the beat system, in which the seniors supervised the sophomores and the freshmen. I remember my beat advisors very well.

Donnelly: It showed; I remember my advisors very well, and I remember the people who were sophomores when I was a junior and who were freshmen when I was a sophomore. I think this is all part of the same pattern. I think the thing that bothers me most, today, is that we haven't quite made this clear to the juniors and seniors--that you can't just take and not give. Primarily, you are taking when you are a freshman and a sophomore. Somebody has to be there to give it to the people who come after you, and this we felt strongly.

This is the difference, as I see it, because we would have loved to go away and live in apartments when we were seniors. We would have starved to death, probably, because most of us couldn't cook, but even that would have been acceptable. But it didn't occur to us to, because you had to stay and be the senior council and be on this and be on that. You had to have continuity.

Nathan: Part of the pattern of going to one institution for two years and to another for the other two years does break up what would ordinarily be a unified four-year sequence.

Donnelly: I'm sure it does. And the people in our halls who do assume the responsibility and who do stay are most often the people who have been here for four years.

We have a very interesting president in one of our residence halls. His father was student body president and lived in a residence hall when he was an undergraduate. This young man has lived in a residence hall since he was a freshman and automatically thought it was part of his responsibility to stay to be president. He is quiet, unassuming, firm, and very good.

But there are not nearly enough of them. This bothers me. When you

Donnelly: have one of those as president of your hall, you have to help him. A great many people helped us when we were upperclassmen. But you don't have to worry about his not being willing to take on the responsibility, because he takes it for granted. One of his great concerns is that not all the other people do.

This is a difference, certainly, and it's a tragic difference for the fraternities. It's one of the problems that the fraternities here have, far more than the sororities, on this campus.

Nathan: So the students are alienated not only, as they feel sometimes, from the administration and sometimes from the faculty, but sometimes from their own fellows?

Donnelly: Of course they are. And the upperclassmen will say to them, "Oh, it's fine for you to do this and this or for you to live here or here, because, after all, you're just a freshman or a sophomore." But the taking responsibility for other people, that they don't do.

Nathan: I think this is extremely valid. Shall we move on to the housing activities?

Donnelly: Yes, let's. Of course there was the committee which established the policies on the basis of which Mrs. Davidson did her inspecting.

Nathan: This was the Committee on Outside Affairs?

Donnelly: Yes. When did it change its name? I don't know but I think it changed its name in the early Twenties.

Nathan: A Committee on Outside Relations was established in 1915. Then, the Committee on Living Accommodations, in 1924.

Donnelly: We knew that Mrs. Davidson inspected, and we knew that she took a dim view of our housekeeping or a good view of our housekeeping, and

Donnelly: that this was important. We knew that you lived by certain standards and rules as far as this was concerned, so we were conscious of this.

And we were also conscious of the fact that there was great agitation for dormitories, because most of us in the sororities, and certainly in the undergraduate group, were aware of the fact that there were many students who wished to live in organized housing and didn't wish to belong to sororities, and therefore had no choice of living in organized housing. You see, most of us had had some experience in living in something like College Hall. We knew what that was like.

When I was an undergraduate, in Prytanean we had a committee which was trying to raise money for University housing. We were all aware that we were paying for the houses in which we lived, but that the people who came before us had to start them, and so, somebody had to start this.

This sense of continuity, I think, is the thing that we were very conscious of. Maybe it was because people talked to us more about it. Maybe we ought to be talking more to students about it. I've made a little jest that if I got mad enough at the ASUC Senate--at whatever they were proposing to do--I might write them and tell them how much money I thought I had contributed, as an undergraduate and as an alumna to their buildings, and I wanted my money back because I wasn't satisfied with what they were doing with this living organism which previous generations had produced for them.

This was largely, I think, because it seemed to me that they would have none of these things if there had not been 60 or 70 years of student generations who had preceded them. I think we should worry more about this lack of historical perspective. Perhaps our elders were smarter in making this clear to us than we are now in making it clear to the current students.

Donnelly: Actually, my undergraduate years were in no sense the happiest years of my life. This notion that your college years are your last years to be gay, and carefree, is nonsense. You have much more fun after you graduate than you do as an undergraduate. But they were probably the four most useful years, because they helped me discover all kinds of things and gave me a chance to do all kinds of things.

Where else could I have gone to college and had the kinds of opportunities to do the kinds of things I did here? Some of them I spent a great deal of time on, and some were just little casual, passing things. But where else could you go as an undergraduate and have as much feeling that you were master of your own fate? I don't know of a university in the United States in which the students had the kind of feeling that we had: that we could do the things that we wanted to do.

Now, to be sure, it didn't occur to us to solve the problems of the world. We hadn't yet taken on the whole world. And our students now have. This makes them feel a bit frustrated. But in the world in which we lived, we had the feeling that we had control over everything.

I suppose there were people who felt alienated from their professors. I was not one, because in my department you had no trouble at all in seeing the people whom you wanted to see, and you had no trouble at all getting advice from anybody about whatever you wanted advice on. I don't know whether the faculty had more time then, or we had a different faculty. But certainly, the kinds of things the students describe as making them not want to go talk to the faculty were not problems for any of us.

You sometimes didn't go see them, but you didn't feel that you were a trouble. Most of us had some faculty who were friends as well as teachers. There were a great many other people who were important

Donnelly: to me. And, of course, the President. The President went to dinner at every house at least once a year. I don't know how he made it.

Nathan: Every sorority, fraternity, and living group, then?

Donnelly: Certainly he went to all the sororities, and I presume he went to all the fraternities if they remembered to invite him. This was also true when Mr. Sproul was first in the President's house. And Chancellor Heyns has done a tremendous job of going to all the houses as far as he possibly can and to all of the halls when he is invited. If they invite him and he can't come for that particular date and they have the good sense to say, "You choose a date and we'll have dinner that night," he has made a date, and has come.

This is a man-killing job now. It was less strenuous then. But we all had the feeling that we knew people. There doubtless were undergraduates who felt alienated. I just didn't happen to know any, but I wouldn't be so reckless as to say that there weren't any. There were 10,000 students when I was an undergraduate. There were 2500 in my graduating class, which cannot be called small.

III POST-GRADUATE LIFE AND CAMPUS TIES

Nathan: And the moment that you were "sprung" what did you do?

Donnelly: I came back to do graduate work and got a teacher's credential at the insistence of my father, who was still paying my expenses. I spent one year teaching high school in the state of California. I consider the year I spent getting a teacher's credential a wasted year, I regret to say.

A Taste of Teaching

The year I spent teaching in a high school in California was, I suppose, not a waste, although it is the only working experience I've ever had that was unpleasant. I went promptly away from it to teach at Lawrence College in Appleton, Wisconsin. I left Lawrence College to come back to the University to do graduate work. At that time I was planning to work for a Ph.D.

My experience at Lawrence College was delightful. Mr. Henry Wriston, who went from Lawrence to Brown University and is now retired, was president. He was a very interesting man. The reason I got the job was that it was a Methodist college and my father was a good Methodist.

Mr. Wriston was the first non-minister to be president of Lawrence College. Tom Barrows, the son of President Barrows, was the first non-Methodist president. Since then they've had many distinguished presidents, including President Pusey of Harvard. But Mr. Wriston was just beginning to build the college into something more than a denominational school.

He hired me, without ever having seen me, because he wanted to know what any young person--with the letters I had from the University

Donnelly: of California and also excellent recommendations from two bishops, because of my father--looked like. I had a perfectly delightful time, learned a great deal about teaching and left to come home to do graduate work.

Advertising and Marriage

I did one year of graduate work, and then I went to work for an advertising agency, because I decided that I wanted to know more about writing. I wanted to know what it was that advertising was all about and what uses they made of words, because I was getting tremendously interested in what students of writing needed to know. So I went to work, met my husband, and married the boss. Don was my boss in the advertising agency.

Nathan: With the recommendations of two bishops?

Donnelly: No recommendations from bishops this time!

Nathan: This was McCann-Erickson where all these nice things happened?

Donnelly: Yes. Then I came back and did another semester of graduate work, then decided that I was really not a scholar, in the proper sense of the word. . .

Nathan: You had been a good student all along?

Donnelly: An adequate student, but not a scholar. . .and that I really didn't want a Ph.D. I've not regretted it. I understand the world is full of people who make this decision who do regret it. My father regretted it very much; he offered to pay all the costs of my graduate education. This was during the Depression. He thought Don shouldn't have to take this on as a responsibility. This was a great disappointment for my father, and I never quite convinced him

Donnelly: that I was right in my decision. But it was right for me.

Nathan: May I ask you, is Don a nickname for Donnelly, or was his name really Don?

Donnelly: His first names are John and Bernard. It's a nickname for Donnelly, and very confusing to our friends, most of whom call him Barney. So I present them with real problems. The people who knew me before they knew him, call him Don, and the other people call him Barney. So he's a delightful man with two names.

After we were married, I decided I'd keep house. Well, I didn't, of course, just keep house. I taught in the University Extension.

Nathan: English?

Donnelly: Yes, a course in diction and vocabulary building, and had the time of my life. I'd still be teaching in San Francisco if I could do it and have this kind of administrative job. I tried. Teaching adults in that course was the most exciting teaching I've ever done. So I tried to combine the two jobs for the first year I was in the Dean of Women's office.

Nathan: You tried doing both?

Donnelly: And you just can't. What happened was that I was not doing a good job at my teaching. I was giving the same old tired lectures; I was not doing the reading I wanted to do; I was arriving breathless at my class. But it was one of the things I should have liked to go on doing.

I suppose one of the reasons it was such fun was I had such diversity in the class, from the immigrant who was just learning the language to the woman who was then writing fashion articles for the Chronicle--Ninon. Remember when there was a Ninon on the Chronicle? Well, of

Donnelly: course, there were dozens of them, I've forgotten which one this was. At any rate, she'd decided that she wanted to increase her vocabulary and so she came.

I thought long and hard before I gave up the class, but there are too many night meetings and dinners in any job in the Dean of Students' office. The courses were at night and in San Francisco. So, I just had to give it up.

Education of a Traveling Secretary

Nathan: While you were teaching in Extension could you travel at intervals for your sorority job?

Donnelly: Yes, part of the time. I didn't travel all of the time. My brother Dan taught sometimes for me. And other colleagues helped. I don't remember how I worked out my Extension classes, except that most of them were only 12 weeks. So I must have somehow managed to work my trips in and around them.

But I traveled for the sorority only for a year. This was when the sorority wanted to experiment with a traveling secretary, and also to inspect all the corporate set-ups of the chapters. This was immediately after the worst of the Depression, and nearly every sorority house had been financed in a fashion which was causing the national organization concern, because the girls were paying far too high interest (sometimes from financial organizations of which their fathers were directors).

So I traveled to more than 50 universities and colleges, inspected all the chapters, and looked into the sororities' investments, and about this I could hardly have known less. Warde Sorrick was manager of the First National Bank in Berkeley. He was a graduate of the University, but I didn't know him in that connection. I had known him since I was an undergraduate and my father had opened an

Donnelly: account for me at the First National Bank and delivered me to Mr. Morrish to watch over.

Mr. Sorrick was Mr. Morrish's assistant; when Mr. Morrish retired Mr. Sorrick took over. He gave me the quick course on investments. This was like Catharine Quire's quick course in accounting when we first financed residence halls. Both of them taught me all 12 words which, if you use them in the right places--and the expert can tell you where--will imply that you know a great deal more than you do.

I had an interesting time talking to the Harris Trust in Chicago and talking to all the bankers and loan companies at the various places in which we had chapters. I'd been president of our corporation here. But that doesn't give you enough knowledge to go around and be an expert. I suppose this is what makes me suspicious of most "experts." For Warde made an "expert" out of me, and I had a lovely time.

I did this for one year. It was very interesting to visit other universities and colleges and to talk with the people at other universities. Actually I learned a great deal about a great many things, including Deans of Women. If you are a traveling sorority officer you always see the Dean of Women. At first you don't know enough to be able to appraise the institution by looking at the Dean of Women. But in those days, after a little experience, you could appraise the institution by looking at the Dean of Women.

I reported all these findings to Miss Stebbins and Mrs. Davidson, who smiled politely without comment. It took me years to find out that they had often agreed with me.

In many of these institutions you met the presidents and many other administrative officers. So I learned a great deal about housing and about other institutions of higher education, and I had no idea that it would ever be useful to me. It was really just for fun, and yet it has been most useful. I wish I could convince the seniors,

Donnelly: all of whom have senior-itis, that there are very few things you do that are a total waste. I suppose most of these seemingly unrelated jobs of mine were good training for my job in the Dean of Students office. But you can't convince the young; you can't convince them that today's decision is not an irrevocable one.

Nathan: Then, you almost had one foot in the door of the dean's office without even being aware of it, and when Mrs. Davidson invited you in. . .

Donnelly: It would hever have occurred to me, because it was not one of the things I thought of as being particularly interesting. But, obviously, I had had certain kinds of experiences that were useful to her.

Honor Students and Phi Beta Kappa

Nathan: What about your experience with the Honor Students?

Donnelly: That was accidental and came about because of my friendship for Larry Harper, whose wife is a sorority sister of mine. Lawrence Harper, professor of history emeritus, was secretary of Phi Beta Kappa, and the advisor to and guardian angel of the Honor Students. Larry asked me to help out, so I did for two years on a volunteer basis, in addition to my teaching in Extension. It was from '40 to '42 that I was secretary to the Honor Students, about which you must know a great deal.

Nathan: Yes, this is where we first met, I think.

Donnelly: It is, indeed. I also acted as secretary of Phi Beta Kappa. At that time, as you know, the Honor Students was a very active discussion group. I don't know what's happened to it, but it's changed. Then it was really organized and had meetings and we had Sunday night suppers and all that kind of thing, but it was a kind

Donnelly: of continuous discussion group. There were people like Dan Koshland [Jr.], who's now here teaching, and Joe Hodges.

Nathan: And Carl Foorman, I think, was president.

Donnelly: Carl Foorman, Carl was president; and Myron Tribus, who is Dean of the School of Engineering at Dartmouth, was president one year; and Victor Waithman; and I think Noel Spiess--I know he was a member, and I think he was president--Noel is now head of Scripps Institute. And then of course there were a great many others. Betty Bauer was a very active member.

Nathan: Betty Kelly then.

Donnelly: Betty Kelly. It was a very exciting kind of group, because there were youngsters who were bright, and not so much engaged in other campus activities. They got interested in other campus affairs, but not so involved, so they did a great many things themselves. It seemed to me during those two years that the officers of the Honor Students spent their lives at our house.

This, again, brings up Lawrence Harper who is another person who knows all about the University. He's interested in the University and always has been. As I mentioned before, Larry was then secretary of Phi Beta Kappa and the guardian and the patron saint and the father of the Honor Students, and devoted to it a great deal not only of his own time but of his own money. Larry was always lending the organization money until the dues and fees were paid.

I don't know whether the Honor Students have a half-time secretary now. The job paid perhaps $75 a month. I know it cost me money every month I had the job because I was never home to cook dinner. I got paid, periodically, when they had money, but it didn't compensate me for my expenses. But it was an exciting kind of experience!

Donnelly: I stopped because I was actually working on a full-time basis and felt that this was a little silly, even though I was having fun, to be working on what was presumed to be a part-time basis when really I was devoting full time to it, and disrupting my home. And so I decided to go back to being a housewife in the spring of '42.

Nathan: Did you stay in Berkeley?

Donnelly: We've always lived in Berkeley. My husband was reared in Piedmont, and born in San Francisco. But we decided when we got married we wanted to live not in Piedmont, but in Berkeley.

Nathan: And did he go to Cal also?

Donnelly: Yes, but stopped to go to work, as a great many young men did in those days. He was working in advertising in San Francisco, so that it didn't matter, Piedmont or Berkeley. But we've lived here ever since we got married. So I went home to keep house and teach in Extension as my only professional activity.

IV A TEMPORARY JOB IN THE DEAN OF WOMEN'S OFFICE -- 1942

Nathan: Mary Davidson got wind of your leaving your Honor Students job?

Donnelly: I'd talked with her because I'd seen her, of course, all the time I was on the campus with the Honor Students. Edith Clymer was in Mrs. Davidson's office and went off to be in the WAC (Women's Army Corps) in the summer of '42. Mrs. Davidson felt that she couldn't possibly replace her quickly because it was too late for that year, so she called my husband, not me, and asked him if he would have any objection to my coming into her office for a year, while she found someone to replace Edith.

I'm literally the woman who came to dinner; I took the job with the understanding that I would do it only for a year, and did it on a yearly basis all the years I was in the Dean of Women's office.

I went on with my teaching because I expected to return to it as my only activity the next year. Of course I like to teach, but I also liked Mrs. Davidson and I thought working with her would be interesting--and it was.

Speeches and Technique

Nathan: Did your interest in teaching help you with all the speaking you had to do? There was an article in the California Monthly about how much in demand you were as a speaker, almost from the moment you got into the dean's office.

Donnelly: This was one of the reasons Mrs. Davidson wanted me to be on her staff. She didn't make speeches, so she hired other people who did. And each of the activities I engaged in--teaching, sorority inspecting, working with the Honor Students--all involved speaking.

Donnelly: I discovered that I made very bad extemporaneous speeches, that my sense of humor was not everybody's sense of humor, and if I didn't think about what I was going to say I was pretty apt to say something I didn't intend to say. This is why I always give a little thought to what I am going to say.

Nathan: Do you still, or are you more off-the-cuff now?

Donnelly: No, not if it matters. If all you are doing is answering questions, then, of course, you can't prepare a speech. But if you are making a speech to time, to a given number of minutes, the only way I know of to be sure that you're going to say what you want to say in the right length of time is to give it a great deal of thought and attention. I usually write speeches out. Every one has his own technique, you know.

Nathan: Do you write an outline?

Donnelly: No. I usually write out the speech, and then fold it up, and don't use it. You see, in the writing out, I put together all the thoughts I have, in the order in which I want them to appear. This is just my method. Other people speak happily from notes, and I have spoken from notes. But this is not the easiest way for me to speak, though I almost never read my speech.

Nathan: So when you went into the dean's office making speeches was part of your assignment?

Donnelly: Yes. There were just four of us in the office, so we all did everything. We dealt with whatever problems arose. We also each had our own assignments. But then, again, because there were so many fewer people, we all had to do everything.

The only thing that I didn't ever do in the Dean of Women's office was to handle loans. This was so specialized a thing that just two

Donnelly: of us, Mrs. Davidson and Catharine Quire, were the loan experts. If you had anyone who was not trained doing it, you obviously got into great confusion. This part of the operation I never had to administer.

Each of us had to understand enough about what was available and what was required to qualify, to make sensible recommendations. And we all had to judge what was and was not a financial crisis.

Executives and In-Service Training

By the way, one of the remarkable things about Mrs. Davidson which I think I have not mentioned is that Mrs. Davidson is one of the few real executives I have ever known, and I don't mean just women executives; I mean one of the few real executives. There aren't many. There are many people in administrative jobs, but there aren't many who are really executives.

She had a rare talent, one I don't believe that she thinks she had. I think she's aware of the things she did that were good, but I think she really doesn't believe she was a good executive. She had a rare ability to delegate responsibility. She didn't breathe hotly down your neck. But she managed to find out (really without your being aware of it until you'd been there long enough so that you'd watched her work) whether or not the task was getting done. She didn't harry you, but you were in real trouble if you didn't meet a deadline.

The deadlines were usually reasonable, not always, but usually. You could explain and explain, and she was perfectly polite about the whole thing, because she was always polite, but you knew very well that she thought there was something else you could have given up in order to meet this deadline. This is a remarkably good thing for a young person who comes into an office to find out. There is a

Donnelly: commitment and you have to meet it. She was reasonable in the sense that, if other things came up which she gave first priority to, you did those. But she was perfectly unreasonable as we kept explaining to her, if she thought you'd had enough time and you didn't get it done.

She trained all of us. We had no in-service training; we had no guidebooks; we had none of the present day management gimmicks. She trained each of us in a standard of dealing with people which was a very sound standard. She wanted you to be sympathetic, she wanted you to be understanding, but she didn't want you to give all your time and attention to one student. So if she thought your sympathy and your understanding of a particular case was subtracting from your effectiveness with other people, she was gentle with you, but firm.

This I learned the first term I was there. We had a student who was in the hospital with all kinds of emotional problems, and I was sure that they could only be solved by my going to see her every night. About the fourth morning I confided this to Mrs. Davidson, and she said, "You look a little tired." I said to her, "I am tired." She said, "My, it will be hard for you to give your full attention to all the students today, won't it?" I learned. She was perfectly right.

She also blew her top--and if you've never seen Bobbie blow her top, I assure you it is a rare and alarming experience--if we lent our own money to students. She explained to us that this was one way to permanently lose the student and that there were all kinds of other ways to handle the problem. Of course, in the Dean of Women's office there always have been other ways, ever since the women way back in the beginning established the Dean of Women's loan fund. There is always a way to get an instant check if the student is in trouble.

Donnelly: There were only a few things that were real sins. Now we have in-service training, and we have courses, and we have books, and we have people whose job it is to train people. But we don't concentrate enough, I think, on the reality that none of this is any good unless the person who is responsible for you is going to give the kind of careful attention to what you're doing that she did. Once she was sure that you could do the job, she stopped.

Catharine Quire and I both thought she had this ability. Catharine and I came from several years of working and we had many habits that were already established, which Bobbie had to accept as part of what she'd hired. But, as we agreed, she did her best to get the ones she didn't approve of out of us. Now, this really is having the responsibility for the job and training the people who do the job, not in your image. Because it didn't occur to her that Catharine and I were going to be as she was. She'd hired me in addition to hiring Catharine to make speeches because she did not make speeches, and Mr. Sproul understood this when she became Dean of Women.

But you also learned about making speeches from Bobbie from her famous phrases, for instance, "That was a good speech, it went right along." "Yes, I liked him, he went right along." And it was abundantly clear to anybody who worked for her what she meant by this. If you diddle-daddled and if you fiddled, and if you paused to think of a word, you weren't going right along. You, therefore, hadn't given very great thought to what you were going to say. So, you got the idea, quite quickly, of what you were supposed to do.

She had certain standards of office behavior and certain standards of dealing with students, and she certainly trained everybody who ever worked for her. She did it, as far as I know, without ever losing a friend. This is a talent. She was not what I would describe as the most placid boss I ever had, because she's not. She's perfectly capable of having Bobbie's kind of tantrum--was then, and is now. But she was fair. After you'd worked a while, you realized that

Donnelly: what she was trying to teach you was very important if you were dealing with students. One of the tragedies of today's world is that none of us is doing enough of this with the people who work for us. To be sure, I was trained to do it, so I try. But I think none of us is doing enough.

On Being Firm and Fair

Nathan: What would you say the main principle would be in working with students?

Donnelly: That you must listen, that you must find out what the problem is, that you must have a sympathetic approach; but that, if it's necessary, you must be firm. There were not a great many things about which you had to be firm. But I don't know anybody who ever encountered her in a disciplinary capacity who didn't have a feeling that Mrs. Davidson had been fair and firm.

As time went on, they usually came to think she was right. You thought she was fair, because she was, and she would listen interminably, but once she'd made up her mind she was firm. But you always had a feeling, again, that she cared about you.

Nathan: You seem to recognize the same characteristics in the various people you've admired over the years. You've said some of the same things about Charlie Raymond.

Donnelly: I suppose I do because these seem important to me. What bothers me in today's world is that in our great desire to be fair, which I think is important, we sometimes aren't firm enough. You see, I think if you aren't firm enough, you aren't fair. If you're a little wishy-washy or if you say, "Well, now, let me think about that," then I think you have not been quite fair to the person because you haven't said, "Here is a line and I've now drawn it."

Donnelly: I think, for instance, in our dealing with students in student government, we need to tell them clearly and completely the things that they can do without really asking any questions. Then I think we have to let them alone to do those, as long as they are within the framework of the University's policies. I think we have to say, if it's opposed to University policy, "No, you may not," but that isn't often necessary. In many things we ought to let them alone. It distresses me when the students have a dance and go broke, because then they have to do something about raising the money to pay the bills. But I think we have to let them do this.

Then we have to be equally clear about the things that we plan to do because they are necessary to the future of the University. One of the reasons that I admire Chancellor Heyns is that I think he does this; I think he's very forthright and very clear in the things that he says, and I think he's fair. But, you see, I think you can't be fair unless you're also firm. Do you?

Nathan: You ask questions that I think all parents ask of themselves, and all adults have to ask of themselves eventually: "Do I know what I really think, first, before I can advise anyone else?" These are the hard questions.

Donnelly: Oh, yes! You have to know, though, what you think. You don't have to avoid being troubled--everybody is troubled. If you can't explain something to somebody, of course, you're troubled. You're always saying, "I guess I don't speak English," or "There must be a better way to say this"--but you can't be too troubled if you have said it every way that you know to say it, you've not lied, and you've not tried to be subtle. Then, I think, if the student chooses not to understand, you have to say, "Well, too bad. This is the student's choice, I have done everything I could to make him understand."

However, you must try to understand why he doesn't understand you. What is the thing in his background or in his present situation which

Donnelly: makes him not able to understand? You have to worry about that because that is going to affect the way you say it to him. His background, what he knows, what he doesn't know, is going to affect his understanding. But after trying to understand, if it's your job to make a decision, you have to make it and then stick to it.

This doesn't mean that I think there's any great virtue in continuous consistency, because I don't. You may change your mind about a thing which is relatively unimportant; there may be a lot of ways to do something, and this may seem a very good way to you today, and tomorrow not as good. But you have to be firm about the things you think are fundamental.

This is the way in which I think we are failing: we aren't firm enough about the things that we think are fundamental--all of us. If we believe something is important, we must abide by it, and then we must be what Bobbie would describe as "sticky" about the principle. There can't be any misunderstanding about what your position is as far as the student is concerned.

Nathan: What is your view about the contention that students should help to make the rules?

Donnelly: I think it depends on what the rules are. On this campus the women have made the rules by which they've lived. This method was here when I came. Bobbie said that it began during the time she was an undergraduate; she graduated in 1906. So it's been here for a long time. I think <u>those</u> rules the students ought to make. I would agree that the Dean of Women ought not to change them. Actually, all the deans I've ever known at the University have spent their time saying to the girls, "Do you really need all these rules?"

It was one of my jobs, when I first came to the Dean of Women's office, to advise the AWS. Bobbie's instruction was to persuade them

Donnelly: to have fewer rules, but when they got through that year they had one more page! It was clearly one of my failures. I tried to be eloquent, but, oh, they assured me they had to have all the rules in writing.

Nathan: These are rules of student conduct?

Donnelly: These are the rules by which the women live: lock-out, etc. They used to be for all women. I think it's a mistake that the AWS has decided they will make rules only for the women who live in organized living groups.

Nathan: This is the Associated Women Students?

Donnelly: Yes.

Nathan: So now it's only for women in organized living groups?

Donnelly: Yes.

Inspecting and Advising

Nathan: Did you have other assignments in addition to advising?

Donnelly: Besides advising student groups, I also did all the housing inspections. In those days the inspection of women's houses was done by the Dean of Women's office. She had a modest appropriation for this, so I inspected all the women's houses and worked with the Women's Dormitory Association and the College Panhellenic and the AWS.

With Alice Hoyt, Catharine Quire, and Mrs. Davidson as the only other members of the staff and more women's organizations than we have now, each of us had three or four organizations to advise.

Donnelly: Now there are several assistant deans, so each one has to take only one. Catharine Quire, who came into the office in '41, was doing seven or eight groups, was loaded down, and was never home at night. So I took on the advising of part of the groups Catharine had been responsible for. Because I was inspecting, I got the women's living groups. It was a great deal of fun.

Then we all saw literally dozens of students. In those days we saw all the entering freshmen; and we saw all of the students who were having difficulty academically. We finally took to seeing them in groups so that while no one of us had been trained professionally in group therapy, we found ourselves engaging in group therapy because there was no other way to cope with the problem.

Nathan: What was the message you tried to get across to the people with academic troubles?

Donnelly: Well, there were two, and they haven't changed over all the years. First you had to find out why the student was having difficulty. Second, you needed to point out, usually, that the problem was caused because the student simply was not studying enough, or was not putting her mind to it.

There are a few problems in which the student was in the wrong kind of course, when we tried to get the student to the appropriate college to see if courses couldn't be rearranged or changed. But most often the people who got delinquency notices got them because they weren't working hard enough. This has always been true, hasn't it?

The so-called group therapy was a great deal of fun. We went to this procedure reluctantly, because we had been seeing the students one by one. But we weren't beginning to see them soon enough, because we'd see far too many students far too late in the semester. That was when we dreamed up this notion, at one of our famous staff

Left to right: Alice Hoyt, Ruth Donnelly, Catherine Quire, and Mary Davidson. July - 1954.

Donnelly: meetings, of trying to see them in groups.

Alice was a very definite person even though she often appeared to be vague because she would be very definite about something, then promptly switch to the other point of view. She was convinced she couldn't see people in large groups. Catharine Quire and I were convinced that we should try. We had a great discussion about what was a large group. Was 15 too large? Was 30 too large? So we kept experimenting. Catharine and I decided, and finally Alice reluctantly came to this point of view, that there are great advantages in seeing the students in groups.

Nathan: How large a group did you think was the best?

Donnelly: We finally settled on 20.

Nathan: What were the advantages, then?

Donnelly: The great advantage is that if you make them talk, which you had to do, (even though every once in a while you would fail miserably because you would have a whole group of silent ones) they would quickly be less scared and help each other. You learn as you do this. I think the later meetings were more effective than the early ones.

You would get one student to say, "But my trouble is that my instructor thinks we are all stupid," or, "The lectures are dull," or something of that sort. Then somebody else would think, 'Well that's a safe comment,' so she would say, "So are mine." Then pretty soon they'd all talk.

This is, I gather, the basis on which we've built all kinds of group therapy since. It's the basis on which Alcoholics Anonymous is founded. This was not our purpose. Our purpose was to find a method of seeing the students soon enough so we'd be of some use to them.

Donnelly: In every group there would be one you needed to see separately. Early on you learned to identify these students. This was one you had to see separately, because she was a very troubled student who was participating, but not saying what really troubled her. We always saw those students individually.

Nathan: And you would spot them in the larger groups?

Donnelly: You could, after a while. We did a great deal of talking about how it worked. There was no other way because there were too many of them and too few of us. And if you saw the student too late and she had too much to make up, you often couldn't help. We tried to see them all in a period of about four weeks.

Nathan: Did you do this after the first cinch notices, was that it?

Donnelly: Yes. And then of course we followed up, and looked at all the grades again.

Nathan: Were you doing this right after 1942 or did this take a while to develop?

Donnelly: The staff was seeing students with delinquency notices when I came into the office. Mrs. Davidson had established it before that, I don't know when. When you added up all the other responsibilities we all had (and I spent half a day inspecting) you realized that we were seeing people at the rate of one about every 15 minutes; this was par for the course; we usually saw 30 people in a day, incredible as this may seem. We weren't giving any of them enough time. We were seeing the entering freshmen, we were seeing the students with delinquency notices, and we were seeing all the heads of all the student activities who wanted weekly meetings.

You almost got to the place where you didn't eat lunch and did not get home at night for dinner. So it was not a noble idea of ours.

Donnelly: It was an expedient idea. It actually worked very well. Catharine Quire and I have talked many times about this since. I'm not sure that pressure is always a bad thing. Sometimes if you are laboring under pressure, you come up with an idea which is a very good idea. So I don't think pressure does any harm. I am equally sure you shouldn't be crisis-oriented, which unfortunately is what we are at the moment.

Nathan: Do you think this has anything to do with your journalism and advertising background, that you understand deadlines and the pressures as a part of your function?

Donnelly: I don't know. Alice Hoyt was from social welfare; Catharine Quire had a Ph.D. in accounting; Bobbie was a history major. And my academic discipline was English. So we came from very different academic backgrounds, and this, I think, was good. I am inclined to be unhappy about our tendency toward specialists these days. What we need really is more generalists.

You need specialists to do special kinds of things. I don't think you need to divide the student up into pieces and have him see the right specialist for the right thing because I think he feels fragmented. I'm not sure that isn't one of our problems now in the University. You think to yourself: "I have to go here to do this, and I have to go here to do that, and I have to go here to do the other thing."

It seems to me that the staff in the Dean of Students' office or the Dean of Women's office should be generalists. We should have all the specialists: the placement people, and the counselling people; and certainly we need the hospital, with its assorted services. But we need people with a great many different kinds of backgrounds in the Dean of Students' office, just as we need them in residence halls and in housing.

Donnelly: This is one of the most controversial issues in the universities in the United States today: what kinds of people you have on your residence staff. Should you have them all student personnel-trained people? Because now there are student personnel training courses. There's a course at Syracuse in which they make little deans; there's a course at Cornell, to mention only two.

Nathan: For training people to function in residence hall settings?

Donnelly: Yes, and in other positions in deans of students' offices.

Nathan: I see. So you're trained to be a dean.

Donnelly: You're trained to be a dean. Just as I'm in agreement with the proposal that our teaching assistants should be taught to teach, I'm sure that people have to learn to work with people. I don't agree that we should only have student personnel-trained people on our residence staff.

There are universities in the United States in which you couldn't get a job on the residence staff unless you've had a student personnel background, because they believe that this is necessary.

Nathan: The residence staff are the people who are actually in the halls?

Donnelly: Yes. I disagree with this point of view because, you see, I think students need to work with people from a variety of disciplines. I think you can train a staff to do the things that it needs to do. This is a question and an argument which is 25 years old in higher education: should all deans and all residence staffs be student personnel-trained? I don't think you should exclude them. Often they have excellent ideas because they have good professional training. I don't agree that we should only have faculty, or student personnel professionals, or all of any one point of view in either deans' offices or residence hall staffs.

Donnelly: But, to go back to your question, which is what started me on this, I think one of the reasons we tried a number of different programs when I was in the Dean of Women's office was that we had similar but different academic backgrounds. This meant that we each approached our problems from a different point of view. We were all generalists. I think this creates an excellent background for what a Dean of Students' office ought to be doing.

Nathan: What should the Dean of Students' office be doing?

Donnelly: I think a Dean of Students' office should be concerned with the problems and the needs of students and the problems and the needs of the institution. I'm putting the two of them together. There is no other office in the University which is really dedicated to this combination. The academic colleges and departments are concerned with the students as persons who are dealing with a particular body of knowledge, as are the professional schools. The hospital is concerned with the students as sick people. The counselling center in concerned with giving tests and helping the students to make vocational choices, to mention only a few of the specialized approaches.

The staff in Dean of Students' offices should consist largely of generalists. I think you need a few specialists, because they help to present a point of view which exists in the academic world today; but I don't think you should have too many of them. There is a real danger if every one is a specialist that every student will become a "case."

The moment that a student becomes a case, I think a Dean of Students' office or a residence staff person has failed. You begin to wonder whether or not he has gall stones or maybe appendicitis, and you stop thinking about him as a person with or without problems.

Again, this is a very controversial issue. There are many experts

Donnelly: in the United States who have written books on this subject, who feel very strongly that you can't deal with students unless you have certain specialized kinds of training. Fortunately the University of California at Berkeley has never held this notion. We've always had in the Dean of Women, the Dean of Men, and the Dean of Students' office a variety of kinds of people. We have in the Dean of Students' office now people from many academic disciplines, including some of the bright young things from student personnel.

Nathan: So that this philosophy that you developed then, in the early days In the Dean of Women's office, is the one that you have fairly well kept and developed in your housing work as well.

Donnelly: Exactly. This, really, is something which Mrs. Davidson felt very strongly about, and I agree with her. It is people who are important.

Nathan: Are there individuals or couples now who are in the residence halls?

Donnelly: Both.

V SUPERVISOR OF HOUSING SERVICES - 1946

Nathan: When you select them, what is it that you are looking for?

Donnelly: A variety of things. By the way, I did this for years and then we changed over so that we made the responsibility more diffuse and a lot of us did it. Now we have returned to a more centralized approach.

Nathan: Perhaps you can clear up one thing for me. I do want to come back to this. When you were named Director of Housing Services--

Donnelly: Supervisor.

Nathan: --Supervisor of Housing Services, Mr. Nedderson was Residence Hall Supervisor, is that the correct title?

Donnelly: And this was based on President Sproul's directive. It's been amended and changed several times since. When it became clear that all of the things that all of the alumni, and taxpayers, and parents, and students, and administrative officers such as Mrs. Davidson and Mr. Norton and Mr. Deutsch and others hoped for were about to take place: namely that the University was, at long last, going to build some housing, Mr. Sproul sent several of us off to look at other institutions.

Nathan: Which ones did you look at?

Donnelly: I looked at Purdue, Michigan State, University of Michigan, Wisconsin, Cornell, Minnesota, and Northwestern. All except Cornell were wholly public institutions, but Cornell is in part private and in part public. Dick Nedderson and I made a very extensive trip after we were appointed, going then to ask particular kinds of questions.

Donnelly: But prior to President Sproul's establishing a Student Housing Administration, which the University had never had until he established it in 1946, Mr. Norton and Mr. Ira Smith, who was Business Manager at Davis, went on a trip; Catharine Quire was going on a trip anyway and went to two or three institutions and made reports; I was going to make a speech in Canada and visit my brother at the University of Virginia, and so Mr. Sproul asked me to stop at some institutions. We all made him reports on what we thought of the structures at other institutions.

Nathan: You're talking about the organizational structure?

Donnelly: I'm talking about the Student Housing Administration. We made extensive reports. President Sproul discussed these, I have no doubt, with his men in the cabinet, and came up with the decision that he would have two persons responsible, a Supervisor of Residence Halls and a Supervisor of Housing Services.

By the way, in the beginning his idea had been Director of Housing Services and Director of Residence Halls, but in 1946 these were academic titles. They no longer are, but they were. This is why they were changed to Supervisor. One was responsible to the Business Manager and one to the Dean of Students.

Nathan: Now, who was responsible to the Business Manager?

Donnelly: The Supervisor of Residence Halls was. The Supervisor of Housing Services was responsible to the Dean of Students. Mr. Sproul's reasons, which he stated clearly, were that as far as he could see from all of our reports at each institution the business officers and the deans were constantly fighting. His idea of the way to solve this problem was to make them jointly responsible so they had to resolve their difficulties.

This has since been changed, but at that time each of us was appointed by either the President himself or the Vice-President,

Donnelly: who was then Mr. Deutsch, on the joint recommendation of the Business Manager and the Dean of Students, so that nobody could be appointed who wasn't acceptable to both. President Sproul, in a closely-packed one-and-a-half page directive, set up the whole Student Housing Administration based on this. His answer was that if the Business Manager and the Dean of Students couldn't settle a problem, obviously they would have to come to him. But he made it very clear that he expected them to resolve it; he didn't expect them to have to come to him.

Nathan: Did you have the feeling that he had any reservations about the wisdom of the University's providing housing for students?

Donnelly: I think Mr. Sproul did have reservations about the wisdom of the University's providing housing for students. I think all of those reasons were understandable. All of his reservations were based on the foundation of the University in which he grew up.

The Regents and former presidents believed that the only responsibility that the University had was an academic one and that it was better for the students to live in the community, the Germanic approach to this. President Wheeler felt this very strongly and said so. He bowed only, politely, to the pressures of people who wanted to give money to the University. This was the tradition in which President Sproul was reared.

The University was young, it had very little money because it was young, even in '30 when he became President. Certainly it was very young when President Wheeler came here. It had very little money and very little prestige. How did you get prestige? You got prestige by having important academic people. This is what Mr. Wheeler had done, this is what Mr. Sproul concentrated on doing, and who in the world could say he was wrong when he built up a University which, in less than a hundred years, has had the

Donnelly: prestige which this University has had.

Mrs. Davidson and I disagreed because we thought housing was important. So we all had lovely arguments about it. But when President Sproul decided that housing was important and that there would be a Student Housing Administration, he gave a great deal of time and attention to it.

He saw Dick Nedderson and me and listened to us and was interested in the ideas we had, and he wanted things to be established so that they would be in line with what, clearly, was now needed. He supported us and helped us.

Nathan: Does this, then, go back to the thirty-day wonders in 1945, when the first residence halls were built?

Donnelly: But then, immediately after Stern was built we had the problem of a place for the rest of the women students to live. We were in World War II then. So during the war we rented fraternity houses for women, nearly all of them.

Nathan: Do you know about how many?

Donnelly: We'd have the records here. But we probably rented, oh, 25 out of the 40, and the Army took most of the others.

Nathan: Did the Navy take over I [International] House?

Donnelly: Yes, the Navy took over I House. We rented Bowles Hall to the Army training program that was here. Then we had a Marine Corps here, and another Army corps rented some of the other fraternities. We rented those from '42 to '45.

The Break-through: Fernwald 30-Day Wonders of 1945

Donnelly: In the spring of '45 it became apparent that many of the men were going to be coming back to the University in the fall and the fraternities wanted their houses back.

Nathan: So that was what put the big pressure on.

Donnelly: Mrs. Davidson promptly wrote to Mr. Deutsch and said to him, "What are we going to do with the women? Shall I write the mothers of prospective students and tell them not to send their daughters because they have no place to live?"

Mr. J. K. Moffitt was then chairman of the Board of Regents, and Mr. Jean Witter was on the Board of Regents as president of the Alumni Association. Mr. William Norton was Business Manager who had participated in all this business of getting the fraternity houses ready to operate for the women. This is a whole story in itself, because we lived an exciting life trying to find enough furniture and trying to get it properly painted and all the rest of it.

But Mr. Norton, Mr. Witter, and Mr. Moffitt apparently were the gentlemen who pushed the action when we had no place for the women. We had to do something to house the women in the fall of '45.

Nathan: Did it just happen that they pushed this through the Board of Regents when Mr. Sproul was on a trip to Russia?

Donnelly: Mr. Sproul probably was away because it was Mr. Deutsch with whom all the meetings were held. I think what actually happened was that when Mrs. Davidson wrote to Mr. Sproul and he wasn't here, the letter went to Mr. Deutsch because it probably wasn't sent overseas. In any event, she wrote him the memorandum asking what she should do with the young ladies who were planning to come.

Nathan: She wrote to President Sproul to this effect?

Donnelly: Yes, and this was handled by Mr. Deutsch, who said, "No, she could not tell them not to come." So Bobbie, in her quiet, firm, ladylike, gentle way said, "I think you ought to take this up with the Regents, because I think we cannot take the kind of fuss and fume we'll get if we have no place to put them and I think we're going to have to turn the fraternity houses back to the men."

Nathan: Then she was talking about approved housing for women?

Donnelly: Right. Almost literally a place for women to live because, remember, in '42, in '45, the community was full. So it wasn't easy to find a place. We were full of everything.

Nathan: War industry people here.

Donnelly: Yes, as well as everything else. So that even if we had been able to go out and find 150 rooms, which we probably couldn't have, it wouldn't have been enough.

So Mr. Deutsch apparently did it. I guess President Sproul must have been away, because otherwise Mr. Deutsch would not have been the one to do this. This apparently triggered Mr. Norton, Mr. Witter, and Mr. Moffitt to worry about doing something. Mrs. Davidson went off on her vacation, early, and went to Lake Alpine. This was when we still had gasoline rationing.

Mr. Witter, Mr. Moffitt, and Mr. Norton got the other Regents interested in the whole thing; so they brought in Mr. Ratcliff--Walter Ratcliff--to talk about whether or not something could be designed, and decided that it could be. They drew up preliminary sketches and the University got the gasoline so that my husband, Catharine Quire, and I could take these plans up to Bobbie, on her

Donnelly: vacation, to see whether she could settle for them, because we had to start building promptly.

Now we built where we did, on the Smyth property, because it was the only property that we owned which we could build on instantly. This was the reason the Regents made that decision. We built the type and kind of housing which we built, with their agreement, because we could use materials--lumber and various other kinds of materials--that had been brought by the navy and the army for various installations, which they were then not going to use because it seemed clear we were coming to the end of the war.

Nathan: So these were literally surplus materials?

Donnelly: Yes, they were. The contract to build was ultimately given to Dinwiddie and Company. Having done an overall design, the architects almost literally planned the buildings as they were being built.

Nathan: It was that much of a push?

Donnelly: Oh, yes, because, you see, we opened them in October.

Nathan: And all of this was happening in the spring?

Donnelly: June. Because it was in June that the Regents finally decided to build these residence halls.

Nathan: Do you mean those things were built between June and October?

Donnelly: Yes. I'd have to look it up to be sure of the dates, but my impression is that they were built from about the first of July to the first of October. We spent a little time with the plans, a little time deciding where the buildings ought to be put on the lot. Then, of course, we discovered that half of the lower lot was zoned for one family dwellings. We tried to get the city

Donnelly: council to give us a variance. They wouldn't.

Nathan: And the citizens had something to say about this?

Donnelly: The people who lived in the area objected and, of course, we didn't have time to argue. So then, we just cut the first hall in half and built the other half up on the hill. Our plan had been to build three identical units with 80 students to a wing.

Nathan: And how many floors, then?

Donnelly: Two, just two floors. The only way that we could do it was to build the short unit for 40 and put another short unit up on the top unit, so that the architects had to redesign it and we lost some space. We had to get all the trees, unfortunately, off the land--those which were in the way of the halls. We didn't take all the trees, but the ones where we had to build.

And we actually opened in October when the fall term began. During the war the University was on the three-term arrangement; we were on that schedule until the end of '46.

We actually opened the buildings with the scaffolding up, with the living rooms not finished, with all the painting not done. The student rooms were painted, the bathrooms were finished, and everything else was in a state of being finished. The central building, where we had the food service, the dining room, and the kitchen, and the recreation room--which we built later--was not finished until the early part of '46. But we got into all of the units in October.

Everybody helped clean and sweep. Catharine Quire and I swept the corridors. I think Alice Hoyt helped in sweeping the corridors, but she refused to scrub out the bathroom. This was not because we

Donnelly: didn't have a corps of maids, because we did. It was simply because they didn't have time to do all these things and still let the students move in.

And we moved the students in on a day on which it rained just about as it's raining today. None of us had thought, we didn't know enough to think, about the fact that the people who delivered the trunks would deliver them all to the main building but wouldn't deliver them to the other buildings. The sidewalks were not all in, and there were a few other little problems.

All the trunks were delivered to the patio area in the old Smyth house, which we had planned to tear down. But we suddenly remembered we had to have an office so we didn't tear it down, thank God, because we've been using it ever since. Mr. Norton and my husband and one or two other people were the trunk movers that day.

Nathan: They literally carried those trunks?

Donnelly: Well, they literally coped; they didn't carry them all around because we finally managed to get boys to carry them up into the buildings. But, you see, these are the kinds of things that anybody who's ever run massive numbers of residence halls knows. But we didn't know these things and we had no idea that the baggage companies were going to deliver everything to just one spot. We couldn't argue them into delivering to the halls. So we had a very exciting move in!

Nathan: Do you remember how the financing was done?

Donnelly: We borrowed the money from the Regents.

Nathan: And paid it back?

Donnelly: At four percent interest, and we're still paying it back. We won't be through until 1969 because we refinanced the mortgage. 45 and 25,

Donnelly: this would be '70. We had originally planned to do it in 20 years. Then it seemed very clear that we could not do it in 20 years, and 25 was fine. The Regents got their interest longer, anyway.

Nathan: And about how much was that?

Donnelly: I'd have to look it up.

Nathan: I have the figure $500,000 in my mind and I don't know whether that was it or not.

Donnelly: Well that, I think, was our original loan. Let me see. We housed 470 students.

Nathan: Were they all girls?

Donnelly: 80 and 80 is 160--originally, I'm thinking of originally because we've made some changes--160 and 160 is 320. 480 was the original number because we had two half halls and five full-length halls in which we had 80. So 480 was the original number.

Since then we've rearranged the rooms, made some single rooms, and some other changes, so that now we house 472, I think. We've added rooms for the staff; we've taken extra room for the head resident.

But we really literally built them all summer long. The students ate on the campus, in the campus cafeteria. We fed them breakfast: coffee and orange juice, or juice, and snails in the Smyth house lounge. Then they came down for their lunch and their dinner at the old cafeteria.

Nathan: That was very small, wasn't it?

Donnelly: Yes, we had to take one dining room for the students who lived at

Donnelly: Fernwald. It was originally known as Fernwald because that was what Mr. Smyth called his property. This was the Fernwald property. Then when we put men into the upper halls, we asked that those three women's names be taken away and reserved for these three halls down here. We had one named for Cunningham, one for Cheney, and one for Freeborn. We asked that those names be reserved and used for these halls and that the upper unit be named Smyth Hall. Then it became Fernwald-Smyth when we had both men and women living there.

The short unit, which of course was named for Lucy Sprague Mitchell, on the land that was zoned for two family dwellings, was not finished. So those students lived for at least a week, maybe two weeks, in Cowell Hospital. Fortunately we had no epidemics and Dr. Donald let them live there.

They had a lovely time. If you've read the Californian of that period, you know. They got to be very cozy and very friendly with not only other students but the hospital staff as well. The hospital fed them breakfast. So, when they came back and had to eat breakfast at Smyth and had to go down to the cafeteria for lunch and for dinner, they weren't sure that it wasn't better to live in Cowell. But Dr. Donald pointed out to them that they couldn't go on living there forever. It was a very gay time.

All the housemothers were amazing; they were pioneers and they were interested in the whole idea. They did a great deal, I think, to build up great esprit. We had seven head residents.

Then we barely got the hall finished and got the cafeteria finished, before we had to put three in a room because we had another crisis about where to put the women. This was a dreadful thing to do because the rooms were not big enough for three, but the Regents decided we should do it.

Nathan: Did I understand correctly that Mrs. Stern was consulted at this time

Nathan: and she said she did not want three in a room in her hall?

Donnelly: You are correctly informed. She was consulted and said no, they might not do it at Stern, so they didn't. We really could have done it in Stern without any great hardship because those are big rooms. But it was awfully hard at Fernwald. It was hard on the staff; it was hard on the students, who fell over each other. And this went on for several years.

We had one year of peace when we were still finishing and getting everything organized and trying to find some money for the gardening. We had a little trouble with that.

Comparative Costs of Building

The original cost was $1767 a student. We subsequently borrowed more money to landscape and to make other improvements. In the end the loan was approximately $800,000. But the original cost was $1767 for each of the 480 students. Every time we build a building now, I think, "My, life was so much simpler than it is." It will cost more than $7800 a student now to build anything, I'm told.

Nathan: $7800 a student?

Donnelly: The residence halls we built in 1959-60 cost $6250 a student. We are now also paying for the land, which added about a million dollars for each complex to the cost. But the construction costs were approximately $6250 a student, or roughly $11,000,000 for the two units. The third unit was about $6800 a student. We couldn't build anything comparable to them now for less than $7800.

Nathan: How many buildings are in a unit?

Donnelly: Four. Four halls plus a central building. There actually are five buildings on the block.

Nathan: So it's four halls plus a central building. Just to skip way ahead for a moment, is it anticipated that you will be doing more residence hall building, or is there sort of a pause?

Donnelly: It is not anticipated that on this campus we will build any more undergraduate single student residence halls. The Subcommittee on Residence Halls has recommended for several years that we build a different type of complex which, actually, if we had had a choice, we would have experimented with in Unit 3. We've talked for years about building apartments for married students and for single graduate students, and some single rooms for single graduates. We'd like to have a variety of kinds of accommodations.

If we had been able to choose the architect and tell him how to build the buildings we would have chosen an X-shaped building for all these units. In this kind of building, the central unit is in the middle, but the halls are attached, not separate buildings. You can arrange this so that the central complex is connected, but each hall has its own separate entrance so that the students do not have a feeling that they are part of a huge building.

This is a compromise with the need for economical use of the land and an overwhelming 24-story building, such as the middle western institutions are building. But after the subcommittee had set up its requirements. . .

Nathan: What was the name of the subcommittee?

Donnelly: Subcommittee on Residence Halls (a subcommittee of the Building and Campus Development Committee). When the committee got all through with developing its program for the new units, the Regents had a competition, an architectural competition to decide on the architect.

Six firms were invited to compete. This was run by the A.I.A.--the American Institute of Architects. A committee with one Regent on it

Donnelly: selected the winning design prepared by Warnecke and Warnecke. It isn't a bad design, but it is not what the committee had planned. We did not want separate buildings. Each student has to go out of his hall to get to his dining hall. When it's raining as it is today either he runs and gets wet (even though we've got covered walk-ways, they leak, and the wind blows back and forth), or he gets all done up in his rain gear to go to breakfast and has to take it all off when he arrives at the dining room.

Our proposal was to have the living room and the dining room adjacent to each other, so they could be used for a variety of things. We are sorry that it wasn't possible to have many of the things which are very good in this plan and still have more of what we had hoped to have with a little closer relationship between the common rooms.

We have some problems that we would not have had if we had a different physical design. This is not to say I think our halls are badly designed because I don't. But there are many things which would not have cost us more and made it pleasanter and more usable for the students.

Housing for Older Students

Nathan: Looking ahead to the possible next development, does your proposed plan imply that there would not be housemothers or residents in apartment complexes for older students?

Donnelly: We certainly would not need to have the same kind of staff in an apartment for married students. We have just one such person, whom we call a Residence Advisor, in the married students' village. She's the wife of a student. We hired the wife of one of the older couples. He's in school; she does this job. She shows the apartments, listens to complaints; she attempts to settle problems. But we administer the married students' housing quite differently from the single students' housing.

Donnelly: In this we are somewhat different from some other institutions. We think the married students want to live as married families. They have to do some things, because they live in a unit that is owned and operated by the University. But there are a great many things they don't have to do; they don't have to have student government; we don't tell them that they have to do this and this.

When the wives get together and plan a nursery school, we find the money to supply the physical setting. But really the wives and mothers do all of it themselves. Oh, we helped them in dealing with the public school administration in working out what seemed to be a reasonable arrangement, but they supplied the ideas and the energy and we encouraged and helped as we could.

Nathan: The whole Albany Village and the married students' housing was a post-World War II development, was it?

Donnelly: Yes. We got 126 units by mistake (we weren't eligible because we were within 15 miles of a public housing unit at Richmond) when the government began to tear down its navy and civilian wartime housing. Every other campus of the University was eligible: Davis, Santa Barbara, and Los Angeles. But Berkeley was the other campus with married students.

We got these, accepted them quickly, and put them up on the Gill Tract. The College of Agriculture let us put them on this land and since then has agreed to have part of the land they own dedicated to married students' housing.

Nathan: Is this the College of Agriculture within the University?

Donnelly: Yes. The entire Gill Tract belonged to the College of Agriculture. Since that original group, we've built 500 new apartments and we have 420 we bought back from the federal government when the land was returned to the University after the war. We've lost the original

Donnelly: 126 because the College of Agriculture wanted that piece of land back, and we had contracted to give it back to them; we did and tore the buildings down. This is how it started and this is how we ever got on the Gill Tract.

I'm not sure that the College of Agriculture would ever have let us put the buildings there if they had thought it was going to be more than temporary. Harry Wellman has been wonderful in helping us to get married students' housing there, even though he has argued with all of us.

The College has been most generous in giving up land that they thought was very useful to them. I'm sure that if I were a Regent or a Vice-President or a President, it would be hard for me to balance the need for housing against the need for decent experimental land.

In all these married student apartments, we have just this one person, in addition to a management staff. Our present resident is very capable. She called me last night and said, "I've just been looking at the television report of the University's troubles and I thought you would be glad to know we were having problems out in the Village, too." Somebody was having a very noisy party, which happens occasionally, and she was getting complaints from many neighbors.

We decided what she should do about it. Then she said, "And let me tell you that if we get the whole thing solved and there isn't any problem, I'm not even going to call you in the morning. If we don't get it solved, I'll call you before you leave home." I haven't heard from her all day, so I assume either she called the police or she called the noisy party hosts and explained that everyone was complaining. Usually that is enough, although now and then we have serious problems we have to cope with.

Certainly part of the married student housing would be able to have

Donnelly: less supervision. It's a question much discussed by administrative officers all over the country: how much responsibility do you have to take when you own and operate married student housing or graduate student housing? Can you let single graduate students live differently from the way you let single undergraduate students live?

Nathan: Does age have an important bearing here, that is, being under 21 or over 21?

Donnelly: Yes. It's a subject, I think, to which most universities have not really faced up, and I don't know whether we have or not. You see, you don't eliminate problems by eliminating people under 21. As long as you have human beings living together you have problems. You have problems in a neighborhood or in an apartment house. Can you deal with it as though it were just an apartment house if the University owns it and operates it? Can you say to the graduate students, "Here are the half-dozen rules that you have to obey, and that's all."? After all, we live in a community; we live in a state which is obviously highly critical of the University of California.

Last night's television programs confirmed the critics' worst suspicions. I don't know whether you saw the 10 o'clock news and the 11 o'clock news. I listened to both because I got home from a meeting in time and I thought, "This is how I can find out what's going on," and so I looked at both. Certainly the television cameras picked out the kind of thing that showed us in the worst possible light.

Nathan: I think the students were given permission to use Pauley Ballroom for their plans, which I thought was a very interesting point.

Donnelly: Those charming commentators I listened to last night said that they used the whole Student Union.

Comments on Student Unrest, December, 1966

Nathan: I wondered whether in your mind there was any similarity between the present student unrest and that of the '30's and '40's.

Donnelly: I don't know. We did have agitators. Because I was here from '39, and then from '40 to '42 with the Honor Students and Phi Beta Kappa.

Nathan: Of course, you were back here in '39 and '40 before your job with the Dean's office.

Donnelly: It was '40; I came back to work with the Honor Students and Phi Beta Kappa, then came into the Dean of Students' office in '42. But I was conscious, in the Honor Students and Phi Beta Kappa, of a kind of minor type agitation.

Then I became, of course, terribly conscious of the agitation when I was in the Dean of Women's office because we all had to be trained to recognize outside agitators. There were no men except Dean Voorhies. And they did train us quite carefully in what the pattern was so that we could attempt to protect the students who didn't understand the pattern. There isn't any way, of course, that you can protect them at all except by exposure, because it's very persuasive.

But, were you conscious of this when you were an undergraduate, that there was a kind of pattern?

Nathan: Yes.

Donnelly: It depresses me to be aware of the fact, nearly 25 years later, that this has a similarity, because I've been one of the people who have maintained that a lot of this was accidental. I'm afraid I don't think it is any more. I think that there are little agitators here. It's depressing. That's why I said it was a bad day.

Donnelly: It is depressing that Mario Savio's immature carry-over and some of the others are (from a different angle because you have to up-date it when you say it) still saying the same kind of thing. This is beside what you want to talk about. It's the reason I was a little depressed.

Nathan: I think I see a lack of wish to come to some sort of understanding or a lack of wish for rapprochement. It seems there is no desire to come to an agreeable solution.

Donnelly: What on earth do we do with the students who are good students, who are intelligent students, and who shouldn't get sold down the river by this?

Nathan: I wonder whether they may not have a hard time for a while, but I suspect that they understand eventually.

Donnelly: But in the meantime you've done them a lot of harm. For instance, we are one week away from finals.

Nathan: Yes, this is really something I wondered about.

Donnelly: I've had five calls from members of the staff today saying, "What do you know about what went on?" And I've said, "Not much except what I read in the paper or saw. Tell me what you want to know, and I'll find out what the answer is." This is the residence staff. Some student or a group of students had asked some staff member and he didn't know the answer.

I had lunch with one of our very intelligent young staff members who is very concerned because of what this is doing to the naive student. And he wonders why we don't say, "This is an organized group and if you want to be part of this group that is trying to destroy the University, that's for you to choose." But, nobody did.

Nathan: Did you happen to see Ernst Haas's letter in the Daily Cal two days ago?

Donnelly: Yes.

Nathan: And except for his misinformation about Congressman Charles Weltner his point, I thought, was admirably expressed and no one has really been able to answer it very successfully.

Donnelly: Now there is a little extra excitement because the Housing Office is moving to Bowditch and Channing--in that place that's cleared off there. Suddenly they are in a great hurry.

Nathan: Is the whole Housing Office going?

Donnelly: No, not the building, they can't move that. But everything in the Housing Office, everything in the Residence Halls Office, is being moved. And they are also moving Purchasing. The contracts have to go out to bid, so Scott [Wilson] and I had to spend time this morning going over and looking at the plans, which do not give us enough space. We may be able to live with it, but they don't know whether we can.

Well, anyway, to get back to Scott, who incidentally was the first manager of Bowles Hall, I think you would find, if you are putting together the bits and pieces of the beginnings of the residence halls, I think you would find Scott's recollections of Bowles Hall most interesting. I think it might add a real contribution to the history of residence halls because a great deal of what we know he learned on Bowles Hall, which was the first one.

By the way, have you read the book about Mr. Sproul that George Pettit wrote?

Nathan: Yes. Well, parts of it.

Donnelly: Now I know why you asked me all the questions. I have now read it all the way through. I read the last three pages and discovered that they had to do with housing.

Albany and Richmond Villages

Nathan: I have a note about UC Village in Richmond. Am I wrong about that? Is that only in Albany, or is there a UC Village in Richmond?

Donnelly: We did have it during the war. We had two things. We rented a part of the Richmond Housing Authority, 300 units from the Richmond Housing Authority for apartments for married students. That really was the beginning. We also rented those barracks that they built and had five or six or seven hundred single men in the barracks.

Scott ran the operation out there and ran the food service for about two years, which was what we did immediately after the war. There was a village in Richmond for quite a long time. Until the Richmond Housing Authority terminated our lease, to our great regret and distress, we had these units. Then we got the 420 apartments which we renovated and later we built 500 apartments.

Nathan: Basically, then, Richmond was for single men and Albany was for couples?

Donnelly: We had both. In Richmond, we had the barracks for single men, and then we also had 300 apartments for married students. Because immediately after the war we had not only the apartments, but the barracks too.

The actual buildings we took over from the city of Albany, the ones that began our married students village at Albany, came in the middle '50's. I think Congress declared them surplus, perhaps in '53 or '54. Because the land belonged to us, the law required that

Donnelly: they tear the buildings down and return the land to us as the land had been. Mr. [Robert] Underhill and Mr. [William] Monahan urged on by Chancellor Kerr, decided that they would make a pitch to buy the buildings, which we were able to do very cheaply because they were surplus. My recollection is that Bob Underhill was very happy that we bought them for $40,000. We then spent about $1,000 per apartment rehabilitating them because they were in very bad shape.

One of our favorite tales is the report which Mrs. Dewell and I made after we had gone out to inspect the buildings to see whether there was any possibility that they could be used. Peggy, who writes far better reports of this general type than I do, said that if you went with a clothespin on your nose and galoshes and wore your dark glasses, you were able to see that there were real possibilities. This summarized the condition in which we found the buildings. We borrowed the money from the Regents.

This, by the way, is the only time I have ever officially gone to a committee meeting of the Board of Regents, when Bill Monahan invited Scott Wilson and me to sit in on the Committee on Finance when they were talking about whether they would lend the Berkeley campus the money which was required to put these buildings together. And Bill Monahan, who was fairly new at the job, was afraid that they might ask him questions that he couldn't answer, even though he was well-briefed.

He need not have worried. President Sproul was so well-briefed that nobody had to open his mouth except President Sproul, who had all the facts and figures and all the things we planned to do and all the reasons we had to do the things. He did the neatest job that I have ever seen anybody do of convincing the gentlemen, about 50 percent of whom were opposed to married student housing on principle (because if you were married you should stop doing whatever you were doing--this was, after all, in the early '50's--and support your wife).

Donnelly: President Sproul, without raising any of these issues, made it all seem simple and so wise and so intelligent for us to do this. And, as I say, he had any fact which either Scott or I could have given him, or Bill Monahan could have after having been briefed by us. He had it absolutely at his fingertips. It was a masterful performance. We were sorry when it was over because we enjoyed watching it. But, anyway, they lent us the money.

Nathan: This would be about the middle '50's, then.

Donnelly: Yes. Mr. Kerr became Chancellor in '52, and actually went on the job in '53, I think. Either late '52 or early '53. I would guess this was '54 or '55. And he made a very strong pitch. He was the one who endorsed our request and who worked very hard to persuade Agriculture that if they would lend us the land we could do this.

Then, of course, after much more negotiation, it was agreed that we would build 500 units on the land, part of which has now been dedicated to housing. This came later, in the '60's. We opened the new apartments in 1963; these buildings that were actually built for married students. But the others are very good and our students like to live in them.

The Case of Married Students

Nathan: Married students were really the last group to be taken in as a housing responsibility of the University, in a sense.

Donnelly: All over the country, this has been the most controversial issue about housing that has ever existed, I think. Because almost all regents and trustees, with a few exceptions, have accepted responsibility for housing single students in varying numbers, depending on the geographical location of the campus, and the private as

Donnelly: opposed to the public supply. Over the country (and I don't think it has died as an issue yet, even though most institutions are now building for married students) this has been the most controversial issue and the issue that has most often brought up the question of socialized housing.

Able, intelligent, thoughtful trustees and regents (because I've heard a number from other institutions) say that they felt this was all wrong: it was one thing to build for the single student but quite another thing to build for the married student. If a man got married, then he assumed responsibility for his family. It was all right if he wanted to go to college or a university, which was where he wanted most often to go, but then the housing should be his concern. And really, this had gone on since World War II. Even though nearly every institution in the country which has any number of married students is now accepting them, they often do so reluctantly, as part of the student body whom they have to house.

Our Regents now accept whole-heartedly married students' housing. Having accepted single students' housing, they accepted the need for married students' housing more quickly. I think that perhaps this was occasioned by the fact that at Los Angeles and Berkeley there have always been large graduate schools; our Regents have been concerned with the graduate school. They have accepted the fact that the graduate student often comes married.

It's rather amazing when you look at the history of their reluctance to build any housing, that having decided in the early '50's that they would ask the state for money for single student housing, in the middle '50's lending their own money, and in the '60's being willing to borrow money from the federal government to build housing for married students.

Donnelly: This is a pretty clear transformation, and I think a very interesting one. Someday I think I'll retire and try to analyze the reasons. I've thought ever since you asked me the question about President Sproul and his original reluctance to spend the money for housing, or to ask for the money, about this. Really, with the shortage of money, I can understand it. But he was reflecting, certainly, the point of view of the Regents of the University.

I was thinking about those Regents I knew who certainly had not felt that we had any responsibility for student housing. Of course, now they all think that we do. Some of us think that they are being persuaded to go too fast on some of the campuses, but you can't have everything as you want it.

Nathan: Does this expansion in responsibility for housing perhaps go back to your own experience? You were first concerned with suitable housing for women.

Donnelly: This was in the Dean of Women's office.

Nathan: Then when you were Supervisor of Housing, did that imply that you were also taking responsibility for the men students?

VI STUDENT HOUSING ADMINISTRATION: STAFF HOUSING INCLUDED

Donnelly: Yes. When Mr. Sproul set up the Student Housing Administration, which he did in '47, it involved housing for everyone--students and staff. When this was established, it meant both men and women, graduate and undergraduate, and faculty and staff. Actually his reasoning was very good; he was a good administrative planner. He unified the service rather than dividing it as they had done in many other institutions, with several offices involved.

If you put it all into one operation responsible for all kinds of housing--approved, housing in the community, housing exclusively for students, housing not exclusively for them, and so on, you have a far more efficient arrangement. If you add staff, you, of course, add their problems, but you add a great many more possibilities than if you have a separate office just to house staff.

Very often in the housing services office, we get listings in which the householder will take either a graduate student or staff, and would probably not make two telephone calls. So, knowing that there are more graduate students than there are staff, the householder probably would call the office which dealt with students and probably not call the office that dealt with staff. So this arrangement is very intelligent. We have one person in this office who devotes her full time to working with staff problems.

Knowing absolutely nothing about faculty housing in 1947, I was overwhelmed when I discovered that this was part of my job. The only thing that I knew anything about was women's housing, and of course the Dean of Students office didn't know anything about staff housing, so I had no colleagues who could advise me.

In those days there was a committee of the Academic Senate known as the Committee on Faculty Welfare. I called the chairman of the

Donnelly: committee and told him what my problems were, and asked if I could meet with him to set up some guidelines. So we did. One of the things that bothered me most was that on many campuses it was set up so that you had two different listings: one for faculty and one for staff. These were all persons employed by the university who just did different things as far as I was concerned.

Interestingly enough, this very nice committee, made up of about eight gentlemen who lunched with me twice while I talked about my problems, each time agreed with me that the listings should not be divided into faculty or staff, but that this should be staff housing. Our concern should be what kind of housing a staff person needed, whether the person was a typist-clerk or a full professor.

Now, obviously the full professor has more money, so that it is a little easier to house him than to house the typist-clerk. But if you can do it all in one office, it makes it very much easier. It was a faculty committee which strongly and firmly told me that I was right, that we should do it this way.

For two years as we fumbled around learning how to handle this--because the University had no housing (this was a matter of going out into the community and selling people on the idea)--this group of gentlemen made themselves available whenever I thought I had a serious problem. I would go with the problem, and they would advise me. They also kept in touch with me and with their faculty colleagues. They explained to other members of the Academic Senate, largely the chairmen of departments, what we could and couldn't do.

So we got finally to the place where they listed their houses, although we did have to write the chairmen of departments letters twice a year reminding them that we needed listings.

Nathan: You housed visiting professors and Regents' professors and all of these?

Donnelly: Oh, yes. Of course, because we are located in Berkeley, we also house all the University-wide people who are new. I think this was not really part of our charge. But we are here, and University-wide doesn't have any office. This explains in part my great unhappiness about the amount of space they've allowed us for our new office, particularly the space they've allowed for the reception area, which is only two-thirds of what we have here; you can see we need all we have here.

We have a very interesting visiting professor coming to Berkeley; the same day we heard from five important administrative persons and two of their wives (in all, seven calls) that this person was coming. So the members of the staff feel that obviously they have someone important coming.

But to go back to your original question, it was not only all students, but also faculty and staff. The thing I knew least about was housing faculty and staff, and how you went about it in the community when you didn't own any housing. I knew very little about listings because this had been something that the ASUC had handled for years which they turned over to us.

Nathan: When did that come to you?

Donnelly: In '46, when the Student Housing Administration was set up. I knew practically nothing about men's organized housing. We had just barely got settled in our first temporary building. . .

Nathan: Was that the tin house?

Donnelly: That was the tin house.

Inspecting Fraternities

Donnelly: Mr. Sproul called up one day saying he had decided that we had inspected sororities with such success, we would now inspect fraternities, and asked how much more personnel would it take if. the next week or the next day, we would start inspecting fraternities. I said jestingly, "At least one more person if we inspected all of the fraternities."

And Mr. Sproul said, "I'm not sure I can arrange that, Ruth. But I think I can arrange to give you three-quarters of a person." This became another one of our lovely jests. The point of it of course was that we'd take a quarter of the time we already had for the person inspecting women's housing and manage to have a full-time person!

Peg was not the first one. Eileen Cravath was the first person we hired to be the living accommodations inspector. Very shortly after that we had to make a change in my assistant, and Eileen Cravath became my assistant before she really got adjusted to inspecting. So Peg was to all intents and purposes the first living accommodations inspector. She's the person who first inspected fraternity houses.

Cooperating with City Inspectors

Nathan: Did she cooperate with public health inspectors of the city, or is this an entirely separate kind of inspection?

Donnelly: We have always cooperated. We cooperate with the building department, and the fire department, and the public health department. In the beginning, the building inspection department sent someone with our inspector. This was how we got to know all of them so well. Then if they felt they needed help, we called in the fire

Donnelly: department or public health. We then got to the place where one year we tried having a team. We had a representative from each department go together. This was a very good thing to do once. It was clearly too expensive; you couldn't afford this much personnel every year.

So now, the city building department makes its inspections, we make our inspections; then we get together on anything that bothers us. We get together with them and then they get in touch with the health department or the fire department if it seems to be a problem which has to do with one of those two.

But we have always worked very closely with the city departments. Actually the city of Berkeley departments are so good and do such a good job that it made the job of inspecting much easier in the beginning. We are all in a pattern now, so we forget sometimes and take for granted kinds of cooperation that had to be built up. Peg Dewell pioneered in doing this with the city. We've had many since, but she was our pioneer.

Faculty Wives and Foreign Student Housing

Nathan: When did you find that the foreign students were a special problem, and how did you get help here?

Donnelly: We always knew that they were a special problem, because they had been a special problem from the beginning. But we discovered that it takes so much longer to deal with a foreign student, because he has so much greater difficulty in understanding you and we had so much difficulty understanding him or her. We were spending five or six times as much time on the foreign student as we were on the American student, and this was obviously unfair because it meant that often we hurriedly just handed listings to the American student when he needed more of our time.

Donnelly: The Faculty Wives participation grew out of my going to a luncheon and being late--a luncheon at which Mrs. Kerr was present when Mr. Kerr was chancellor. Imogene Bellquist and Rowena Hamilton were there. I was embarrassed at being late. So I went into detail.

I blew my top about the reason I couldn't get out of the office: nobody else had time to try to understand this foreign student and I, who speak no Spanish at all and have to rely on my knowledge of French to even guess what the words mean, was trying to cope with a Latin American student. I don't know how he ever got admitted to the University of California, because unless he understood very much more than he appeared to, he was already lost. I had tried to talk to him, and that had made me late.

I had said that I clearly was going to have to hire someone who spoke 19 languages, in my frenzy of exaggeration. The three ladies, Mesdames Kerr, Bellquist, and Hamilton were all members of the Faculty Wives Foreign Student Committee. Mrs. Kerr called me the next day and said, "Why couldn't we get together and talk about this, because, after all, we have a hospitality committee."

So we did, within a day or two, meet at Imogene Bellquist's house. Either Imogene or Rowena was then chairman of the Foreign Student Hospitality Committee. They offered to help; we started in a small way, and it's grown to be something that we just couldn't live without.

One of the things we have fought for in our new building is some-place where the Foreign Student Faculty Wives Housing Committee can operate three times a year: four weeks in the fall and two weeks at the beginning of each of the other quarters. So even though they are actually in the office only eight weeks out of the year, they have someone whom we can call constantly. There is a whole section of the Foreign Students committee which is now the

Donnelly: housing committee. It's simply wonderful. What they do is to give the student time and attention.

They use the regular listings. They have some specialists in various languages on their committee. But they ride the students around to look at these places, because our other problem was that after you'd spent time with and given attention to the foreign student, giving him a map, explaining how to use it, then he would look at you blankly and say, "Where is Bancroft Way?" Or, if we were in the little tin building, "Where is the edge of the campus?" These ladies came when we were in the little tin building and sat in the outer office.

Nathan: Was that on campus?

Donnelly: It was first where the Pelican building is now, then they picked our building up bodily and moved it to where Barrows Hall is. Then they moved us here (on Bancroft) when Barrows Hall was about to be built. Now they are going to move us again, because the Art Museum is going to be built here.

But the faculty wives came and sat outside, so sometimes you could hardly see them. It would be like sitting in this outer office, surrounded by other students, with everybody listening to everything they were saying to the foreign student.

This is how this [help for foreign students] came about, and it has been so valuable to us and to the foreign students that it is understandable that we have been fighting for space for them. We finally settled for having a conference room, which we also need for the Residence Hall staff meetings.

It is sometimes difficult to explain these needs to architects who don't have staff meetings and don't deal with the public, and who are preoccupied simply with square feet and how much they cost.

Donnelly: We're going to have a conference room which we won't be able to use for eight weeks of the year except for the Foreign Students Committee.

Nathan: Do you have someone specially assigned to work with the Faculty Wives Committee?

Donnelly: Oh, yes. Anne More does this. Anne speaks several dialects of Chinese, a little Japanese, and what's her other language? I've forgotten. She's enormously helpful to us with all Asian students, helpful in a variety of ways. She now works with the committee completely. Peg and I just thank them every year and say hello to them when we see them, but Anne is the one who works with them and makes reports for them, and gets our office organized to work with them. I am repetitious on the subject of how wonderful this committee is, because I have a long memory, and I can recall how awful it was when we didn't have them.

Nathan: I've heard foreign students speak of this service, and it is immensely appreciated.

Donnelly: The members of the committee, some of whom I know very well, tell me that it is very helpful to them, because they get to know some of the foreign students in a way that they otherwise would not. When we are all exhausted, and the days have been difficult if not impossible, we gather quietly someplace where no one can hear us, and compare stories: the faculty wives, members of this staff, and Anne. One of the faculty wives, who is a perfectly charming person, always has incredible stories. And after we've all relaxed and laughed, we can go back to work again.

Financing Residence Halls: University-Wide

Nathan: I wonder if I could go back to the question of financing the residence halls. Is the financing of the residence halls on the

Nathan: Berkeley campus related to the residence hall financing on the other campuses, or is each campus separate?

Donnelly: We are all part of a state-wide pool. The Regents of the University of California have borrowed the money for all of the campuses. This is very difficult for the older and better established campuses, such as Berkeley, because we are paying for the new campuses,as well as our own building.

When, as George [Pettit] says in his book, it was decided that the Regents would ask the legislature for money, which they did in the late '40's or early '50's for residence halls at Davis, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, and Berkeley, we did it on the basis of asking the legislature to put up half of the money for the first set of halls. The taxpayers had shouted about no housing for their children but they had contributed not one cent of state money. It seemed appropriate to suggest that they might like to help produce the housing. It was just prior to the Korean War that the Regents made their request, and Earl Warren was governor.

Nathan: This was about 1950, I think.

Donnelly: Right, 1950. The Regents made a request to the state legislature for a subsidy of half of the cost of building X number of halls at Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara, and the legislature appropriated the money.

President Sproul appointed a state-wide committee with three representatives from Berkeley, three from Los Angeles, one from Davis, and none from Santa Barbara because they had not made their move to Goleta. That committee met not only to plan the residence halls, but to agree with other persons from each campus that we would build the pilot hall at Davis. This we did do, and the committee planned the pilot hall for Davis. The plan was to go on

Donnelly: then, and build at Los Angeles and at Berkeley, and ultimately, though not then, at Santa Barbara, after they had moved to Goleta.

The legislature appropriated half of the estimated cost of building for 800 at Berkeley and 800 at Los Angeles, 400 at Davis, and 400 at Santa Barbara. This money was actually allocated. Governor Warren signed the bill. And Mr. Voorhies, Mrs. Davidson, Mr. Norton, and I went representing Berkeley, along with other people from other campuses, to watch the governor sign the bill. We were all very excited.

We then planned the pilot hall at Davis. It seemed very sensible to us that we should wait until we saw what those plans looked like in a building before we planned for the other campuses. You will recall that, unfortunately, when the Korean War intervened, the State of California decided that it wanted to call back any money which was not already expended. This money had simply been appropriated, but we hadn't yet spent it. So that money was gone, and we had to start all over again.

In the middle fifties right after the Korean War we again asked for an appropriation which we got. So Units 1 and 2 and two similar units at Los Angeles, three halls at Davis, and two at Santa Barbara, were all built on the basis of 50 per cent financing by the state. We all agreed based on what we knew from other institutions that we needed to have a 50 per cent subsidy for a given number of halls before we started 100 per cent borrowing to finance them.

This number varied with each campus. At Berkeley, we thought we needed 1200 with a 50 per cent subsidy, so that we could have something to build on before we began to borrow the money to pay 100 per cent of the cost. Unfortunately this got diluted, so that Berkeley, Los Angeles, Davis, and, in part, Santa Barbara, found themselves in the position of having agreed to a financing system which they knew could be met by the students on their campuses, and

Donnelly: then having it changed because buildings on other campuses were added to it. When we came to build Unit 3, the only money the state gave us was what it was then doing for the state colleges; to give a million dollars for the dining complex.

Now, whether it's proper or improper for a state to appropriate any money for even the beginning of residence halls, I won't attempt to debate. But it is a fact, demonstrated in institutions all over the country, that you simply can't start from nothing, borrow 100 per cent of the cost, and expect the students to pay all this back. Because you have to charge rates that are too high.

We have been in the state-wide system for a number of years. (I should say I have no quarrel with the state-wide university, because I think there are more advantages than disadvantages.) This is certainly one of the disadvantages, however, as we add campuses, that the building of residence halls on those campuses has to become part of the total Residence Hall debt.

So our allocation of debt per student per year is entirely unrealistic and out of line with every other major institution in the United States. We are trying to meet far too great a mortgage cost. It would be exactly as though you had bought a house with a $20,000 mortgage, and after you'd owned it three years the bank came to you and said, "We have just decided that you will have to pay on a $40,000 house."

In effect, this is what has happened to us. I agree that it has to be all one system because the Regents have to borrow the money. But it is putting us in a situation where our charges to the students are getting completely out of line.

Nathan: Would this explain the rise that was announced in 1963, for example? There was a statement that the Regents raised the price.

Donnelly: It was just last year; they were going to raise it at the beginning of this year, '65-'66. Projected on the five-year plan are further increases, no part of which goes to the cost of operating, which of course has risen. We'd have had some increase anyway, but the raises projected by the Regents go to the mortgage.

Again, this is perfectly understandable when you look at it on a state-wide basis. It's almost intolerable when you look at it from the point of view of a given campus, and Berkeley, and I gather Davis and Los Angeles have the same problem. It is difficult to meet the debt committment and also do the things we need to do for the student residents.

Nathan: Now, for instance, as residence halls are built on the Santa Cruz campus. . .

Donnelly: They are all in the same pot. I should say that the present business administration, under Mr. [Charles] Hitch, has made a very great effort not only to understand but to adjust, and we are at the moment in the process of negotiating and hoping that we will get to a reasonable place, which is still not realistic, but is better than the situation we are in. Because you can't stop eating in order to pay the mortgage, and we have almost been in this situation this year.

But the original plan, the thing to which we all agreed 10 years ago, was that if we had a 50 per cent subsidy for Units 1, 2, and 3, that within 10 years we doubtless could get to the place where we could borrow all the money for a unit and pay it back. But no university about which I know anything can survive in residence hall building without some subsidy.

And it is perfectly fair that when you build up a backlog of paid for buildings you still take a percentage out of the room and board

Donnelly: fees of each student who lives in one of those to go into supporting the new halls. After all, I helped to build the present student union and so did you, and this is historically a perfectly sound thing to do. But as we are now trying to do it, it is unfair to the present students.

We are attempting to borrow 100 per cent; this is presenting us with all kinds of financing problems. I hope we can resolve this problem soon, because every campus is going to have this problem shortly. And that is that our costs are out of line with the costs of other accommodations which the students can get in the community. This is certainly not the position the University wants to find itself in. While it shouldn't be the cheapest, it shouldn't be the most expensive, either. We're fast getting to the point where the students won't be able to afford to live in our halls. We're trying to find a solution, but we haven't found it yet.

The Controversial Nine-Story Residence Halls

Certainly no record of housing at the University or our residence halls would be complete without talking about our Units 1, 2, and 3. I've mentioned some of the problems and joys of these halls in what I've said before. These halls point up some of the problems which any university has which is dedicated to the diffusion of responsibility as the University of California is. Our residence halls are a perfect illustration of some of the problems. First, we had had a subcommittee which built the Davis pilot plan; we made some mistakes and learned from them.

Nathan: Were you involved in this?

Donnelly: Yes. Mrs. Davidson, Mr. Norton, and I were the Berkeley representatives, and it was a very interesting experience. Norman Jensen,

Donnelly: by the way, who is now the second-in-command in our Architects and Engineers office was the young project architect who learned how difficult we were to get along with at the time of the Davis pilot halls.

When we came to plan the halls for Berkeley, we had a very good committee, with people on it who knew quite a lot about housing; we had good students on it, and many meetings. We did mock-up rooms; we got the advice of students on furniture. We actually had several state-wide meetings to which various furniture people came. This furniture which we have in our halls was actually built to our specifications, to fill the needs the students indicated they had. The students both on the committee and others brought in to advise suggested the sizes of the rooms, the arrangements, etc.

However, we had a major problem because the Regents decided to have a competition to choose an architect after we had drawn up the program. It was a closed competition run by the AIA, restricted to six architects; each architect took the program and translated it into his own designs; these were submitted to the AIA committee which selected an architect. The Regents hired the architect, and then the committee and the architect had to try to get together and make their design fit our program.

This produced practical difficulties in our residence halls, about which the public and particularly some architects speak critically. None of these things was acceptable to the committee. But, because we were given a design, we had to do the best we could to fit in the features vital to residence hall living. This is not the ideal way to build a residence hall. It is certainly not the way that anyone who lives through it would recommend to anyone. Then we built Unit 3.

Nathan: Which are the components of Unit 3?

Donnelly: Norton, Priestley, Ida Sproul, and Spens-Black. When we came to build Unit 3, we owned the land; and we knew we weren't going to have enough free money, even though we could borrow enough money. So we agreed to build to the same design, with any changes that could be made within the outer structure: we couldn't change the structure.

We got many changes that were good changes, but not enough, because we had to build into those halls some of the problems we already knew we had in the first two units. Whether the Berkeley campus was wise or unwise to agree to this, I don't know. But we did, with, I should say, considerable pressure on us to agree to it instantly.

Certainly there are many things that are better about those halls than the older halls. This is not to say that they are actually not good residence halls really, because they are basically. It is to say that I think it is tragic that when they are as good as they are, we were not able to make them much better. Unfortunately, we were stuck with a design which had already been accepted by the Regents.

Nathan: So the committee actually had no part in the working out of the designs.

Donnelly: Not any. We established the program, and theoretically and in some cases actually, the spaces allowed were the spaces required by the committee. But it's a little like the plan for our new office. There were far too many places in which there was enough difference, so that it made a difference in the way students lived. For an instance, we did not want a separate building in which there were the dining rooms and the kitchen; we did not want a plan in which our students were always going to have to walk outside, no matter under what excellently covered walks, to dinner, because this is not the way for people to live. We wanted the living room and the

Donnelly: dining room to be adjacent and adjoining. This presents real problems, and will present real problems for the 100 years that the buildings exist, or 200, or however long they exist. Because you will always have to deal with the students who live in those halls in a slightly different fashion since they really have to put their hats and coats on to go out to dinner if it's raining. Now, if it is lovely and spring-like, they don't. But we do live in a world in which it occasionally rains. There are other equally annoying features.

However, the committee worked hard and did, on the whole, I suppose, a reasonably good job. The committee had said it would not settle for any buildings that were more than six stories tall, so we got nine story buildings. Again, in the matter of the design and the use of the land, I think the committee was right. I think nine stories is too many. And I think our fellow institutions building 26-story residence halls are just building problems for themselves.

While I wouldn't for one moment suggest that the kind of difficulty we are having on the campus now is in part because of the way we make 2520 of our students live (because I don't think this is true), I think that to have them separated on floors, even though they are only 26 to a floor, is not as desirable as it would be to have them in a different kind of room arrangement.

Well, they are good residence halls despite all this. But it's sad they aren't better. If the committee had just learned this since we opened the halls in '59, it would be different. But the committee was sure that these were built-in problems before we built the buildings.

The Student Housing Administration

The last time I talked about the Student Housing Administration,

Donnelly: which is part of all this, Mr. Nedderson was the Supervisor of Residence Halls. Mr. Nedderson went on to be the person in the office of the Vice President--Business (in University-wide administration) who was responsible not only for the problems of financing and things I've mentioned, but a whole variety of other things.

Scott Wilson, who had begun as the manager of Bowles Hall and had then been the principal food service manager, became Supervisor of Residence Halls. He later had his title changed to "Residence Halls Administrator." About seven or eight years ago, the staff in the Dean of Students office agreed that Mr. Sproul's directive, which made one person responsible for all of these things, was unrealistic, because the program was growing.

So we began to divide the responsibilities; the people in the Dean of Students office who had responsibility for other organized groups took the responsibility for that phase of the residence hall operation. We've operated this way for the last several years.

Nathan: Would that be student government?

Donnelly: Yes. Student government, staff, and faculty fellows, and all the kinds of things that go on in all student groups. We've operated this way with a variety of changes, with the Supervisor of Housing Services maintaining all of the contractual relations and being concerned with dealing with business matters.

Last summer, it became apparent that we had got so diffuse that we couldn't make a decision without having a committee meeting, which was a little unhandy. So Dean [Arleigh] Williams appointed a committee of the people in residence halls to make proposals for changes of administration. This we did.

VII REORGANIZATION -- A NEW PLAN

Nathan: Is this the Committee on Living Accommodations?

Donnelly: No, this was a Dean of Students' and Business Office committee which was to make a recommendation to him and to Vice Chancellor Campbell. We made a variety of proposals for change. So in May, it was decided that Scott Wilson and I would be responsible for residence halls except for contractual matters, the taking of applications, the assigning of students, the handling of contracts, etc. This Peg Dewell would do and become Supervisor of Housing Services.

Mrs. Dewell and Mr. Wilson and Mrs. Donnelly therefore have become a "troika!" We are concerned with all housing, with residence halls and food services (because Scott also handles all the other food services) being Scott's and my problems and all the other functions of the Housing Office becoming Peg's.

Nathan: Can you tell me what your titles are to be?

Donnelly: Dean Williams's proposals are either "Director of University Housing" or "Associate Dean - University Housing" for me, "Business Manager, University Housing and Food Services" for Scott, and "Supervisor of Housing Services" for Peg. Obviously, Peg and I still have to have a close relationship so that one of us can take over for the other during vacations. It is impossible for anyone to be continuously accessible, and you cannot operate anything that involves human beings in residence unless somebody is always available.

This doesn't mean that we don't have competent staff in the residence halls: we do. It doesn't mean that our students aren't responsible. About 75 per cent of them are. It simply means that

Donnelly: if you have a problem involving students, you need to cope at once. And if you have to have somebody to ask a question of, this somebody has to be there. So, actually, Peg and I have shared this responsibility.

We're still working out details and we hope that by the end of a year's operation we will all be clear on what each of us is doing. Scott and I have spent many hours during this so-called holiday period reviewing what we did in the fall quarter, which we planned hurriedly over the summer; we've tried to decide what we think worked, what we think didn't work, and what changes we ought to make. He and I sat here the other day and said to each other, "I don't really think that's working very well, do you?" "No, I don't think it is. What shall we do?" All the head residents and graduate residents are responsible to me; all of the managers are responsible to Scott.

Nathan: Are the head residents graduate students?

Donnelly: In the halls where we have couples, they are. But they would be graduate students who were either within a year or so of their doctorate or at least in the second year of law school. They are the heads of the houses.

Nathan: Are they sometimes faculty members?

Donnelly: No. This is a full-time job. The graduate residents, who are students, are responsible to the head residents. We have three supervisory persons in each hall. That is, we have a head resident and two graduates in each one. The managers--residence halls, food service--are all responsible to Scott. Scott and I have a hope that we can make a unified staff out of three sets of people--head residents, residence hall managers, and food service managers--who have thought for a long time that their

Donnelly: interests were different. Now that we are all reporting to the same boss, the Dean of Students, it will help our individual residence hall staff members. But the first year of a reorganization inevitably is rugged.

The young man who came to interview me to ask me what I really did, said, "How do you spend your time?" and I sighed so heavily that we both were almost swept out of the office. Finally I asked, "Do you mean the time in the office, or the time out of the office that I spend on business?" He hadn't meant that at all, of course, because if I were efficient I would get it all done in eight hours a day. This would be fine if you weren't dealing with people in residence.

I said to him that actually, this year, I had spent 50 per cent of my time in meetings, which was not my idea of a good way to operate. This is inevitable in the beginning. We don't aim to have it that way.

We hope that if we can find the right words, and then respond promptly to the questions, soon our staff will get used to working with us and understand our hopes and our plans for the halls. We are trying to get our Residence Hall staff to take more responsibility. If we can be crystal clear to them, we can, we hope, give them enough confidence to proceed on most matters themselves.

Nathan: Many of these meetings, then, are with the head residents?

Donnelly: Some of them are. We set up a system in which each unit is supposed to have its own administrative body, made up of the head residents and the managers (food service and residence hall). We decided we'd let them elect the chairman, because we aren't yet committed to the notion that what we want is a boss for each of these units. This is what they have done. They usually rotate the chairman. They meet once a week. We meet with them every

Donnelly: two weeks. That's one of the things that isn't working awfully well, so it's one of the things we have to make some changes in. But we are hoping that they will sometime come to the place where, given clearer definitions than we have given them, they will be able to make some of these decisions for themselves.

I'm not sure we'll ever get to this happy state, because we are dealing with that uncertain commodity, the human being. But this is our aim. This is why I know we've spent far too much time talking about budget and talking, really, to ourselves about how things ought to be organized, talking with Dean Williams about how he would like them to be.

We put all of our general ideas in writing, of course, in June. They are quite important policy decisions which can make students mad or make them happy. When we think we've come to one of those, we have a feeling that the Dean of Students, who's going to be the one to whom everyone complains if something goes wrong, has a right to say, "I like this one," or, "I like that one."

Some Old Issues

Nathan: Is there some sort of structure whereby the students are consulted with respect to some of the rules? I was thinking of some of the stories about the sign-out books and the girls' complaints.

Donnelly: Now you are talking about the women's rules. These rules have been made by the women students and are now made by the women students. They were made that way when I came to the University and they are still being made that way. The AWS--the Associated Women Students--Executive Committee produces the rules involving women's lock-out, and then sets up the judicial committees which administer these. That's something which is campus-wide, and the residence halls simply fit into the same pattern; they live by the same rules.

Nathan: So there is no administrative decision made through your offices that enters into the question of the girls wearing slacks to dinner?

Donnelly: "Shall the girls wear slacks to dinner?" does come to our office because this is an administrative rule and is not covered in the Associated Women Students' rules. It did come to our office, and we did decide that if they weren't having served dinners they could wear slacks. I must say I think they look awful, but I think as long as we are going to serve cafeteria meals we have absolutely no right to ask them to get all dressed up to go carry a tray.

The rules about dress were made by the Dean of Women, for a lot of reasons, which you and I would understand, and which I think are probably just as valid now as they were then. But we've changed since then. We began with five served meals a week and we now have only one served meal in one unit. We have two units in which they have no served meals. At Fernwald-Smyth they still have five served meals because of the setup with their kitchen and dining room, and there the girls do wear dresses. At Stern, they have five and there they wear dresses, not for breakfast or for lunch, but for dinner.

But anyway, the young ladies may wear pants if they are not going to have served meals. One of the reasons that they have cafeteria service is that they thought they liked it. Instead of trying to argue them into served meals, because cafeteria's cheaper (and there was the debt hanging heavily over our heads), we agreed to it. Fernwald-Smyth was distressed that they might have to go to cafeteria meals from their five served meals. I'm sure that if the specter of debt had not been hanging over our heads, we would have sold all of them on the idea that they liked served meals. But we simply couldn't spend the money to serve the meals properly and it seemed ridiculous to do it improperly. It's

Donnelly: another far too long answer, but the cafeteria service seems to me to have some flaws as a way of life.

A New Approach: Co-ed Halls

Nathan: I did want to ask you a little about the establishment of the co-ed dorm pattern. Was it 1964 that it began? I have Richards-Oldenberg and Fernwald-Smyth listed.

Donnelly: Smyth-Fernwald is the whole complex, which includes Smyth Hall, Richards-Oldenberg, and Mitchell-Peixotto. There are three units with separate wings. In the fall of '64, we decided to experiment with Richards-Oldenberg, making one wing for men and one wing for women. We had an almost equal number of spaces for women as we had for men, and this, of course, is not in line with the University's enrollment, which has almost two undergraduate men for every undergraduate woman.

So we had far greater demand for housing for men than we had for women. It seemed unfortunate to keep turning the men down. Not only unfortunate, but terribly bad public relations. We had already taken all 200 spaces of Smyth for men, and we decided we would try having Oldenberg, which is one wing, for men; and Richards, which is the other wing, for women. This was, and is, quite successful.

Last year, because of the many kinds of pressures that we should have specialized kinds of halls (freshman halls, upper class halls, etc.), we sent questionnaires to all of our re-applicants and all of our new applicants asking a variety of questions, asking for their preferences, i.e., would they rather live in a hall for just freshmen, etc.? We got a very interesting reaction out of the questionnaire. We found that 75 per cent of the students wanted a cross-section of students, wanted various disciplines, wanted

Donnelly: various classes, and for reasons which they stated very explicitly. They felt they learned more.

We got enough people who said they would be interested in an upper class-graduate hall, so we decided that we would experiment. We took Mitchell-Peixotto, which is the smallest, housing 40 women and 78 men, and began an upper class-graduate co-educational hall. It's too soon to tell whether this is a good thing or not. We've had some problems because they have not had to live by the rules that women may not be in the lobby after lock-out, and so on.

I <u>think</u> the experiment's successful, and I think it's a good thing. But after only three months, it would be stupid to say, "I'm sure." I think there is a place on a campus of this sort for a co-educational unit for upper division and graduate students. I'll know a lot better in June of '67. That will be far too late, however, because we are going to have to make up our minds about whether we are going to continue it by April.

Nathan: Are you thinking of polling these students to ask their views?

Donnelly: We really don't have to, since we have seen so much of them because it was a new hall and because it was an experiment. I don't pretend to know all 116 well, but we've seen so much of them, and the head resident and the two graduate residents have done so much talking with them, we have some clues. The president, who interestingly enough is a junior, a man who'd lived on the hill before and was elected to carry on this year, has his executive committee and his judicial committee, because they have certain kinds of problems with upper division and graduate students that other people don't have. I think we will poll them.

The people who are living there, with a few exceptions, like it very much. We do have questions about whether we are right to have practically an absence of rules. I say "practically" because

Donnelly: we aren't without rules. We still have the University rules. And the women had to apply for upper class key privileges as other upper class women do. The thing was granted almost instantly, because these were all people for whom the extended key privilege was intended, upper division and graduate women. But I think it is a good experiment. And the co-educational hall is a good thing too, I think. It takes, however, a very good head resident; it takes very smart graduate residents.

Manville Hall

Nathan: In the light of the answers you had from the students you queried about how they want to live and the varieties of people they like, do you have any observations about the residence hall in the law complex?

Donnelly: I have almost no comment I can make about that politely because we discovered the other day that we were going to be responsible for managing and paying for it. I've never seen the plans. None of us had anything to do with planning it, so that we really don't know much about it.

Nathan: It's really a separate entity then?

Donnelly: Oh, quite. We just found it on the residence hall account for 1966-67. In fact we found we were paying interest on money borrowed from the federal government, out of non-existent income. It will come, of course, from the income from our undergraduate students.

Nathan: I was under the impression that Manville Hall was a grant, a gift.

Donnelly: I guess not. I guess it is in the future--it's a promise, not the money. Actually we have, with more than our ordinary vigor, raised the question about why we find this $46,000 worth of interest on

Donnelly: our state-wide debt commitment this year. We hope to have an answer before the end of the year, so that our single undergraduates and our married students will not be paying for this hall. I have now told you almost everything I know about it, except that it's named Manville Hall and that I see it when I go home every night because I go home by way of Piedmont Avenue. Scott has actually seen the plans, I understand.

I protested so violently at a state-wide meeting about finding this on our bill that a man who didn't know me kept calling me "Mrs. Manville." It caused mild hysteria. So he came to the conclusion that my name was Mrs. Manville. So now when Scott and I are feeling a little grim, one of us calls the other "Mr." or "Mrs. Manville." But this is all I know, except that it is presumably opening in the fall of '67, I trust without any of our single students' money having been spent on it.

Nathan: I thought I would ask.

Donnelly: You can see it's just like pressing a button, and out comes that little man who barks at you.

Nathan: It gave me pause when I saw what was going up and I wondered how it fit in to University housing plans. Now you have explained it to me.

Donnelly: I think it is lovely for them to have a residence hall for law students if this is what they think they need. I have no evidence that would indicate that single law students want to live in a residence hall, but then no one ever asked me for any evidence. So my assumption is that the law school polled its students and decided that it has a great need for very expensive housing for single, male students.

Nathan: It's about the only on-campus housing, is it not? It's literally

Nathan: within the campus bounds.

Donnelly: Bowles Hall and Stern Hall are on the campus. And Fernwald-Smyth has now been declared officially part of the campus. What have we forgotten that I should tell you?

Nathan: I'd like to ask you your views about the relative values of various kinds of housing accommodations: the residence halls being one, perhaps co-ops another; other private housing: fraternities and sororities and privately run boarding houses, for example; and then other private accommodations, such as apartments.

Donnelly: I have very strong convictions about this, so this is something I can answer easily. We are a University and always have been, and a university implies choices. You go to a college if you want a certain kind of education. If you go to a university, you want to be able to choose. I think you should have exactly the same choice in your housing accommodations. I would regret very much a decision on the part of the Regents to make it mandatory for anybody, be it freshmen or anyone else, to live in residence halls.

My great pitch in my 25 years working for the University and fighting for residence halls has been that this was a choice that the students didn't have, and that they ought to have. I think sororities, fraternities, co-operatives, privately operated small houses, and residence halls all present organized student living accommodations for students who want this kind of thing. Then, I think parents, if they and their children choose to have them live in the community, in private homes, in apartments, or whatever, ought to be able to make this choice.

This is in exactly the same category as making a decision about whether you want to major in physics or major in English, or you think you want to go into the school of law or you think you want

Donnelly: to go to the school of medicine. It's this kind of diversity which you come to a university for. You ought to have the same choices in housing. This involves all the people related to it having the kind of crystal ball that even the men who believe in ESP haven't invented yet. You want to have the right percentage of each of these kinds of housing so that it will all be financially successful, and also successful in satisfying the students.

Of course, in this kind of world we will never live. But this is the ideal: that you should not have too many people who want to rent rooms, you shouldn't have too many people who want to rent apartments, you shouldn't have too much space in the residence halls, and so on.

I suppose it is because I'm in my twenty-fifth year at the University that I see student choices as going in cycles. I don't think students are going to want to live forever in apartments. There was a time when everybody fought with us because they couldn't get into organized housing, be it sorority, privately operated, co-operative or non-cooperative, or residence hall. There is now a tendency to think that the ideal way to live is in an apartment.

Many students who live for a year in a residence hall and then go to live in an apartment for a year, want to come back at the end of that year, because they find that living in an apartment sounds fine, but turns out to have quite a lot of work attached to it, about which nobody had ever told them. The food doesn't come from the grocery store without your ordering it and carrying it; it doesn't get itself cooked without your having to stand over a hot stove.

Everybody's always asking me this question, and I'm volunteering the answer to you whether you want to know it or not. I think we have a slightly higher percentage of students who are living in

Donnelly: apartments now, a slightly higher percentage of women students, largely because their permissive parents (if you will forgive me), are willing to sign their residence cards if they are under 21. They weren't so willing to before.

Nathan: Is there a problem of quiet for study in the residence halls?

Donnelly: There is a problem of quiet for study wherever students live. The difficulty is that not all the students want to study at the same time. If we could just have a master calendar and a master clock for all students who lived in apartment houses (because we spend our lives listening to householders and students complaining about their problems) or organized groups, so that everybody wanted to study at the same time, everybody wanted to be noisy at the same time, everybody wanted to sleep at the same time, then you'd have no problem.

But we're talking about people who are between the ages of 17 and 22 or 23. At that age, you haven't found out how big your voice is, you haven't found out how much noise you can make without even trying, and you don't realize that when you're annoyed at somebody else's noise, they're equally annoyed at yours.

I think that in every place where more than one student lives there's a problem of noise. There's a problem in our residence halls; there's a problem in sororities and fraternities; there's a problem in every approved house (I gather there is from listening to students and householders), certainly there's a problem in the co-operatives, and there's a problem in every apartment house which is basically for students. It's a serious problem.

It's one of the things we stew and fret about in the residence halls. Our student officers stew and fret about it. One despairing president in a men's hall said to me just before the quarter ended,

Donnelly: "You know, really, there isn't any solution. Because the people on the second floor were all complaining about the people on the third floor, quite rightly; then the people on the third floor started to take their finals. The people on the second floor got through, so now the third floor was complaining about the second floor." I agree with him. He said, "I think we ought to assign students on the basis of when their finals come. And I'm going to suggest it to Mrs. So-and-so. And she'd say, 'Tell me when you're going to have your finals, and I'll tell you who your roommate is going to be.' Because then we could at least get it quiet in certain rooms." He's right. There is a problem.

We have a real problem because of the physical structure of our buildings. If you have four buildings going up nine stories, around a court, and one student who is tired of studying walks out onto one of the balconies, it's incredible how many people he can annoy, just making a modest type noise. He annoys the students not only in the residence halls, but also the people who live around, who all complain to us the next day. And he might be a young man who has spent seven or eight hours studying and is just stretching, thinking, "I'd better get up and walk around," as you learn to do when you own your own home and wish your neighbors to think well of you. But he goes out on the balcony and shouts.

I wish I knew how to solve this problem because I think it's a serious one. We had less noise this year and less complaint about noise because the quarter system kept them so busy. We had less damage in the men's halls than we've ever had in the fall of the year. Again, I think, because they were kept so busy. So it may turn out that this is one of the great advantages of the quarter system to those of us who are concerned with student housing.

Nathan: Even though you have to reshuffle people three times a year instead of two?

Donnelly: Actually, we don't. We have year contracts, so that unless they are leaving the University, they are obliged to stay for the academic year. We are sorry to have to have academic year contracts. I believe in choices and I wish we had just a quarter contract. You simply can't. There isn't that much time, and you couldn't have this kind of continuous turnover. So, two years ago now, we went to year contracts to experiment with them. We're in our third year of academic year contracts. It would be entirely inaccurate to say that they are popular with students, because they aren't. They'd like to be able to change. Even if they don't want to change, they would like to avoid feeling "hemmed in."

One of Peg's ghastly jobs is to explain to the young why they can't just cancel their contracts. Having seen a few of them myself, I'm aware of the fact that it's almost intolerable to try to explain to somebody who's decided to move why he can't. But the majority of them want to stay, not move. So I'm talking about five per cent maybe. The five per cent makes so much noise that you think they are 100 per cent.

Nathan: This problem obtains in other housing, in addition to the residence halls.

Donnelly: Everybody has academic year contracts. Actually, every other university in the United States went to year contracts long before we did. Most universities have operated under year contracts more than 10 years. Many have always operated under them. Stanford, for instance, has always had year contracts. When I talk about year contracts, I'm talking about three quarter contracts. We've not done what some institutions on the quarter system have done, and this is to have 12 month or four quarter contracts that permit one quarter off, but make no guarantees that you'll have housing when you return even though you are obligated under the terms of the contract!

VIII DEAN, UNIVERSITY HOUSING, AND THE VIEW FROM SEPTEMBER, 1969

Nathan: We have the chance, Mrs. Donnelly, to do a little checking up that isn't often possible. We started in December of 1966 and here we are in the fall of 1969, and you now have the title of Dean, University Housing. All of this gives me a very pleasant opportunity to ask you to look backwards and forwards and comment on anything that you like.

Some of the topics we might talk about include the question of the nine-story residence halls, Unit 2 and the People's Park, the question of Manville Hall, and possible earthquake hazard, a look to the future, and some of the activities of the subcommittee on residence halls. Any or all of these are really very interesting and we would be happy to hear what you have to say about them.

Donnelly: Let's start with an explanation which really is an apology for my having been so slow in going over the earlier interviews. One of the things that bothered me very much when I first read over the transcript was that it had so much more about Ruth Norton Donnelly in it than it did about the history of housing. That troubled me so that it stopped me every time I tried to make suggestions for revisions or corrections.

Finally, I realized what you were doing, and that was to get one person's opinion on a variety of things about the University of California, a person who had had a long experience as student, alumna, and administrative officer. So I stopped worrying, though I still think it is much more about Ruth Donnelly than it is about housing.

Nine-Story Halls: An Evaluation

Donnelly: I welcome the opportunity to review and to bring up to date all the housing matters we talked about three years ago. The first thing I should do is to say more about the nine-story residence halls, because obviously on the morning that we discussed them, I was trying to talk about too many other things, so I didn't do justice to them.

These halls are, as I suggested, of course, the composite of the ideas of a number of committees, beginning with the original pilot committee, and ending with the sub-committee on residence, which planned the halls. Unfortunately, after all this work a decision was made to hire an architect who designed the buildings based on the program without any consultation with the people who had planned them. This is one of the reasons that we have some of the problems in these nine-story halls, which are so widely publicized in the Daily Californian and the local press.

In that unfortunate document produced by Sim van der Ryn of the School of Architecture, called "Dorms at Berkeley," the flaws are described in detail. What is not said there (or in any other criticisms) is that despite their flaws these halls have produced very good housing for a great many University students and have given those students satisfactory and happy experiences.

The physical structure of the nine-story buildings (nine rather than six which the committee specified because of land cost), the separation of the dining rooms from the residence halls, the two-story church-like lounges, produce built-in problems which all of us who planned the program regret very much.

There are other features which are very good. For instance, the students like the student rooms. They complain about the size

Donnelly: of the student rooms but not the shape. They like the moveable furniture. The shape, the moveable furniture, all give some flexibility. Some of these things for which the committee fought have clearly been worth those hours we spent in occasionally unhappy committee meetings.

The long, narrow, high ceilinged living rooms (really living room is a misnomer; they are lounges) and the lack of spaces where small groups can congregate is a very serious problem. The walls of windows over which the draperies are always drawn are most difficult. We have spent the last five years trying to get some of our own money back to make some changes in these rooms. We have not yet succeeded, because unfortunately there are so many things which we continue to have to do because of some deficiencies in building that we have not had money for capital improvements.

We will not be content and happy until we are able to accomplish some of these changes, and until we are able to make some single rooms out of the double rooms. We have beautiful plans for these conversions, but no money. This is, alas, one of the things that we were turned down on this year.

The mistakes that we made were made by everyone who was building 12 years ago. The mistakes that we did not make, but that were made for us are unfortunate and unnecessary. That should be part of this record. However, these halls are superior to most of the residence halls which have been built over the country in the last 15 years. They are a better size for students, with 210 residents rather than 800 or 1,000, and they are planned with more concern for students. But, they still have too many features in them that they ought not to have.

Mistakes Made for the Planning Committee

Nathan: Would you like to talk about some of the mistakes that were made for you?

Donnelly: The most important mistakes that were made for us, which I have mentioned before, were: first, an architect was chosen in a competition planned by an AIA [American Institute of Architects] committee. His plan was accepted by the Regents. This is no way to build a building. The architect should start with the committee and then after having listened to the committee, create a design.

The two-story living rooms, the long corridors, the residence buildings separated from the dining rooms all were part of the design accepted by the Regents and presented to us. Second, the overall plan has produced all kinds of problems in the patio areas, on the exterior, in the windows; we've had continuous leaks for 10 years.

Third, the executive architect hired an interior decorator over whom we had no control. Over the last 10 years, we have had to replace nearly all the furniture, while we repaired and put together the furniture that is still there. We also had no control over the colors, which the students have wanted changed since the beginning.

I don't mean the student room furniture because that we had designed to our specifications, all carefully checked with students, and produced by manufacturers for us. It was all the rest of the furniture which has been such a problem.

Fourth, the buildings were planned with only one elevator for nine stories. It is constantly breaking down, and it is not

Donnelly: adequate. And fifth and last is the major mistake, there are no ramps to get into the buildings of Units 1 and 2. We did get ramps in Unit 3, in which we are able to make a few changes. This means that all of our handicapped students have to live in those halls. These mistakes the committee did not make.

Nathan: Are more buildings contemplated now?

Donnelly: Not of this type. We have for five years been suggesting that the housing which we build in the future should be more flexible, probably apartments with some arrangements for common rooms. The buildings should be planned for use by single undergraduates, single graduates, and married students. This is what we need. We have not ever wanted to house all the undergraduates, in this type of residence living. We simply wanted them to have this type of housing as one choice.

Proposals for Apartments

Nathan: Is there anything immediately projected?

Donnelly: The Regents have voted to build apartments on the controversial "People's Park" block. There is a sub-committee which unfortunately has no one on it who is closely connected with the operation of student housing, so that our knowledge and experience is not represented. I am not familiar with what the plans are except in a general way.

I have seen the proposal which the committee made; we are not in agreement, because we don't have any evidence that the single students really wish to live in suites with shared kitchens and in some cases shared bathrooms. We do have a great deal of evidence that our students do like to live in apartments. An apartment means to us a self-contained unit with a bath and a

Donnelly: kitchen. We have put in writing our concern about this and our distress; whether or not the sub-committee is going to listen to us, we don't know.

Nathan: Does the current talk about rent level problems in Berkeley affect the operation of these residence halls?

Donnelly: No, not now. This is at the moment not the focus of the students' concern. It could, however, become a problem when the students investigate our mortgage payments. It does affect the other part of the Housing Office. Mrs. Dewell is very much concerned with that problem and is meeting with innumerable committees and groups.

Nathan: She is on the new city council committee now, isn't she?

Donnelly: Yes. She is doing her best to reflect the students' concern. And I worked on the problem when I had her job. She and I both think that our mortgage payments in the residence halls are too high, and it could get us involved in the general distress with high rents. This would definitely affect us.

Problems of Debt Allocation

Nathan: I take it that this is not something this office controls.

Donnelly: This is not something this office controls. We have written reams of reports on the subject of what we think our fair share would be, but we don't control it and this is one of our still troublesome problems. As I suggested in 1966, Mr. Hitch and his successors have been certainly doing their best to try to make the situation more equitable for the various campuses whose housing is established.

Donnelly: We don't think our allocation is equitable now. We had to raise our rates this year far more than the cost of living would require, and we will have to raise the rates next year in order to meet the debt allocation for next year. We feel that this is unwise and unfair and have said so with considerable vigor.

Nathan: Does this mean that you are actually helping finance the building of dormitories or residence halls on other campuses?

Donnelly: Oh, yes, indeed. That is exactly what it means. We are not just paying for our own halls, because in ten years we have paid on our debt more than $6 million. Inasmuch as Units I and 2 cost only slightly in excess of $11 million, it is quite clear that at the rate of $6 million plus for ten years, for the next thirty years, we will have paid either an extraordinary amount of interest, or more money than we borrowed.

Nathan: This is part of, I suppose, what you referred to when you said, "This is big business."

Donnelly: Yes, it is big business. I'm sure if I were trying to finance residence halls on all nine campuses, I would think this was the perfect way to finance housing for the campuses that are new and it wouldn't hurt anybody. It does hurt people and I think that our students are having to pay more than we think they should have to pay for the services that we are able to supply.

Nathan: Could you give an example of what this year's charge will be for would it be, a year's contract?

Donelly: They are all academic year contracts. In Units I, 2, and 3, which is really what we are talking about, the cost for the year is $1080 for three quarters. This is for a little more

Donnelly: than 36 weeks, but not much more.

Nathan: That is room and board?

Donnelly: Yes. Room and board. Three meals a day, six days a week, and two meals on Sunday. So it is all inclusive, linen, telephone service, and everything.

It is a lot of money and a little more than a third of that goes to pay the debt. We have a little less than two-thirds to run the operation. This presents us with rather continuous problems.

Manville Hall Revisited

Nathan: Speaking of problems that have sort of come into your field without your necessarily volunteering for them, I might ask you about Manville Hall, the residence hall in the law complex.

Donnelly: I noticed when I was reading through our discussions in 1966 that I told you I knew nothing about Manville, except that we discovered we were paying interest on a loan, which had been a little astonishing to us.

Later on in the spring of 1967, we discovered that we were managing and operating Manville Hall without having had anything to do with planning it, without any idea what the program had been. It was planned entirely by the School of Law and the architects, both executive and campus.

It has been a constant problem to us because, first of all, we have not ever been able to make enough from the charges to the residents to pay the costs of operating and paying the mortgage. To cover the cost, we have gone in the hole, so

Donnelly: to speak, each year of operation -- 1967-68 and 1968-69. As long as we can't have a deficit, because this is not permitted, this means that the undergraduate halls have picked up the difference, because the Manville deficit became part of the over-all debt of the group A housing. Our Units 1, 2, and 3 are picking up the debt.

Nathan: Manville was not completely paid for by the donor's gift?

Donnelly: Manville may ultimately be paid for by the gift, but the gift was a promise to pay. It was in the will of the gentleman for whom the building was named, and at the moment, the building is financed by a federal housing loan. We are paying interest and principal. If you want to know what that produces, we have to charge $1320 a year per resident to live at Manville in a double room.

Nathan: Is that the equivalent of three quarters?

Donnelly: Yes, it is the equivalent of three quarters or two semesters for the Law School.

We also discovered, of course, that there were not nearly enough law students to fill the building who wished to live in the building, so that we have never had more than half of the residents who were law students. We have had to permit other graduate students, and finally, in desperation, other students over twenty-one to live in the building. We have done everything possible to operate this efficiently and as inexpensively as we can, but still we come up with this cost, which the students consider is excessive, and with this we have no quarrel. We think they are right.

Whether 40 years from now or 30 or 20 years from now when the

Donnelly: half million dollars in Mr. Manville's will comes to the University, any part of that will come back as benefit to our residence halls I don't know. But it doesn't do our present students any good. We find ourselves operating a building which we should not have built had we had a choice. It is difficult.

We also have a kind of joint concern about it because we have the School of Law people involved in it, not in the management and operation but in the administration. It presents us with about as quaint an operation as it would be possible for anyone to think of. They couldn't be nicer, more agreeable or more unaware of what our problems are. Every single one of the deans and assistant deans with whom we work in the School of Law have been delightful and charming gentlemen, exasperating almost to the breaking point.

We had a slight student revolt last spring about something we didn't even know was a problem. We discovered we had leaks in the building that had never been repaired. The residents lived there for six months without getting towel racks or mailboxes. Don't ask me why they weren't delivered. I don't know. The architects assured us that they had been ordered. I presume this is true, but we have had a series of strange misadventures.

It points up, I think, unfortunately what we are a little afraid may be going to happen again -- that is the kind of problems you have if people, troublesome as those people are, who are concerned with the mechanics of operating housing, have nothing to do with planning the housing.

I spent a long time on the telephone yesterday with the father of a young woman, who would like very much to live in Manville, but does not wish to live with a roommate. She doesn't understand why we have a graduate hall which has all double rooms. I

Donnelly: found it a little difficult to explain to the father myself, because I don't understand it either. I felt that it wasn't appropriate for me to tell him, as long as I worked for the University, how stupid I thought we had been. So I had a little difficulty getting at that one. His daughter has no objection to paying $1320, but for this amount of money she would like to have a single room. I don't blame her. If I were a graduate student, I would have just that feeling.

Now, after I have said all that.-- there are students who like living there. This is not, however, reflected in our re-applications. I regret to say that we had so few re-applications this year that we have told no one the number except our bosses. This usually is a measure of whether or not your hall is successful. This was not because all the students living there were third year law students who had finished their degrees. They were largely first-year students who went off to live somewhere else.

It is a problem and I think will continue to be a problem. We are attempting to cope with it by every means we know. We have meetings occasionally in which all of those involved get together and try to decide whose responsibility a particular phase of the operation is. We usually just go away muttering to ourselves. As I indicated to you in December of 1966, I hoped that we were going to have nothing to do with it. I assure you that we have felt this way ever since we discovered we were.

Nathan: Another question about Manville Hall which may or may not have any merit to it, is the question of earthquake hazard. This has been in people's minds with the recent focus on the problem. In the construction of Manville Hall, has the question of such hazard been evaluated?

Donnelly: I have no idea, because we had nothing to do with building it.

I do know that in our Units 1, 2, and 3 these matters were taken into consideration, and we did have engineers who were concerned with what they described as "stress and strain" and earthquake provisions. We haven't had a bad earthquake since we built Units 1, 2, and 3, but in the slight earthquakes that we have had there has been very little awareness in the halls, of any earthquake action.

Nathan: That's encouraging.

Donnelly: This is encouraging. And in the 12 nine story buildings, we were concerned about proper precautions because this area occasionally does have earthquakes.

Unit 2 and the "People's Park"

Nathan: With respect to one of the events of the past, People's Park difficulties, we said briefly that Unit 2 was directly exposed to that area. How did the residents of Unit 2 feel about all the excitement of what was going on there?

Donnelly: We had a very interesting situation. It is constantly said, and with some justification, that the majority of the students on campus were in sympathy with the People's Park; certainly if you can get 12,000 students out of 28,000 to vote whether they understood the question or not, you have some measure of interest. However, the figures are used as figures often are used, a little light-heartedly because this isn't a majority of the student body, although it was clearly a majority of those who voted.

Our students in Unit 2, with one hall having some well-known

Donnelly: activists as residents, were very much distressed by the activities at the "People's Park," because the noise, they thought, was excessive. I understand that they were among the people who complained rather steadily to the Berkeley Police Department during the period when the Peoples' Park proponents were continuing all night long noise plus other activities which even our rather liberal students thought were not appropriate activities. Interestingly enough, the students complained about Peoples' Park with very few exceptions, even though they had much sympathy for some of the things that were being done.

Who can tell what students will do? Certainly not one who has worked with students as long as I have. I would hesitate to be so bold as to make a statement. But they were very unhappy about it. This was rather uniform. There were a few who were not, obviously. There probably were a few who were down there helping to persuade the rock bands to go on until 4 o'clock in the morning. It was entertaining to all of us that they were complaining about noise, because our neighbors have, from time to time, complained about the students in our halls. This was a nice twist.

Nathan: The Berkeley Police Department has records on both sides, then.

Donnelly: I presume so, although I have not asked them. The students who complained made this clear to all of us.

Plans to Increase Student Control

Nathan: This brings us to ideas that you mentioned briefly before in your "Look to the Future": some thoughts that you're developing about student responsibility, some proposals that you may be bringing up.

Donnelly: We are hoping that we will be able to go back to what I consider the former liberal days as far as student control over their own affairs is concerned.

In my time in college, when of course there was, as I think I suggested in "My Life and Times," only a student judicial committee (not a student-faculty judicial committee) reporting directly to the deans and to the president in making decisions on all discipline matters. We are planning in the residence halls this year to try to go back to letting the judicial committees and the student governments control any affair that is not strictly a landlord matter, with which we have to be involved. We hope that we will be able to persuade them that if they have the authority, they must take the responsibility.

If we give them the responsibility to discipline the students for the various types of mistakes that students make, they will take that seriously. We hope they will not feel that this is "Mickey Mouse" as they have before, and that they will take the responsibility. Our hope is that we will be able to strengthen our judicial committees and our student governments, so that within the framework of state laws, University regulations, and their own rules, the students actually will be able to control their own affairs.

I'm not sure that we have the same kind of feeling of responsibility in the students now that we had when I was an undergraduate. I'm not quite sure why, but I propose to bet, perhaps unwisely, that if we give them the authority and the responsibility, they will take it. It has to be something for which I will ultimately be responsible. If it doesn't work, I'll know we've failed. But we propose to try. In short, we are going to try to give the control back to the students.

Donnelly: It may not work, but it did work once. It is also what they are asking for. So, we are going to try to give it to them with the help of our staffs. I discussed this with all our staff when I interviewed them, although I'm not sure whether they all understood what I meant. I do have promises from all of them that they will try to make it work. I've discussed it with the old-timers, who have many reservations, understandably, but who are prepared to try. With Dean [Arleigh] Williams's concurrence and enthusiastic support, we are planning to "treat them as adults."

Nathan: You are going to start in the fall of 1969?

Donnelly: This is our plan. If it doesn't work, I can't think we will be any worse off than we have been.

Nathan: When you speak of strengthening the judicial committees and student government, do you mean within the halls?

Donnelly: I mean within the halls.

Nathan: So you have judicial committees within the halls, do you?

Donnelly: Yes, and student government in all the halls.

Nathan: Are these separate entities for each hall?

Donnelly: Separate entities for each hall.

Nathan: In what way is this related to, let's say, the ASUC structure? At all?

Donnelly: Not at all. The women's rules, which have been in great controversy for a long time as you know, have been made by the AWS (Associated Women Students). In the spring of 1968 the AWS

Donnelly: Board voted to adopt merely a code, not a set of rules, to allow each hall to make its own recommendation on rules revision. This went forward last year under Dean [Betty] Neely, the Dean of Women. In the spring of this year, 1969, she recommended that the administration of women's rules be transferred to me.

We experimented with this in the summer of 1969. We permitted two of the women's halls to have rules revisions (which to put it briefly means that every woman in the hall has a key.) The woman does not have to be in at one o'clock or 2:30. It is much more involved than that because the women set up all kinds of safeguards, but that is briefly what it means.

This worked reasonably well in the summer and we are going to continue it this year. We are also permitting visitation by members of the opposite sex for a 12 hour period a day, seven days a week if the students want it, but with the understanding that they must administer it. This has changed from visitation only on one night a month I think or maybe two in 1966 to our present program based on student committee recommendations which we have accepted.

We accepted these changes with the understanding that student governments would administer the program. Now I hear from everyone, including some students, that they aren't doing a very good job. We are going to have to say to them as Dean Williams and I agreed this year that if they don't do a good job, we will have to stop it. If they can do a good job administering it, so that the other students are not bothered and it does meet customary standards of conduct, we will continue it. This is again going to be, obviously, one of our very controversial problems this year. We think it is a good idea if the students will administer it.

Nathan: Is there a general agreement on customary standards of conduct?

Donnelly: No. This I think is one of our major problems. I believe that more than 50 per cent of the students have a standard of conduct which would be acceptable even to our most vigorous critics. If this is true and we can persuade the more than 50 per cent to make themselves heard and felt, then they will see that these standards are met. If it is not true and my estimate is incorrect, then we are in trouble. And we may be in trouble. But it seems to me that it is worth trying. This is our look to the future.

Nathan: Once you have this program underway, waiting to see what happens, can you judge what sort of possible influence it might have on other student activities and regulations on campus? After all, this does in a sense parallel some activities that the ASUC used to administer. I'm thinking really of the judicial committees.

Donnelly: It is very hard for me to appraise that and to make any comment because I haven't been close enough to the ASUC. In recent years I find myself so troubled by the many voices all speaking at once about the problems of the ASUC that I honestly don't know. Everyone hopes, I'm sure, who has anything to do with it, that the students will be able to achieve some kind of balance and, therefore, can be permitted to manage more of their own affairs.

I'm not sure there is anybody who is sure this will be achieved. We do have a responsibility and we do have to concern ourselves with all the students and not with the thousand that enjoy spending all the rest of the students' money. It is not an easy kind of problem to solve.

Certainly this program in the halls ought to have an effect, but whether it will or not I don't know. Whether they will be able to think of themselves as more than a group of students who have causes and go back to thinking of themselves as a community of people who are concerned with managing their own affairs, I don't know. Maybe if it starts in the residence halls, we will be able

Donnelly: to have some influence on the rest of the campus. All I really know is that I believe it is worth trying in the residence halls.

Laws and a Lack of Facts

Nathan: You were saying last time that the in loco parentis view of the University's function is long gone. You are now really saying that you hope to see the students regulate their own affairs with respect to visitation rights. I'm sure you are also aware of the comments about use of marijuana all over the campus, or of alleged use in the halls. Is this, let's say, possible drug use,something that the student government would be responsible for also? Is this part of the conduct code or is it just not mentioned?

Donnelly: This is something which we are trying to resolve right now. We are trying to talk about it. There are, however, state laws governing narcotics which must be followed, so the students cannot be expected to handle this.

Actually I think that there is much less marijuana smoking and the use of other drugs in our residence halls than gossip would have it. I would like nothing better than to have some good research, intelligently prepared by someone who is capable of doing this kind of research. The research that has been done in other universities indicates that far from the 75 per cent which everyone talks about, about 30 per cent as a maximum have used marijuana.

We have this year a new staff member who has just spent three years in the army in the Medical Service Corps. He did very interesting research on this while he was stationed in Vietnam. He is a candidate for a higher degree in Social Welfare. He gave us a very interesting report on this based on his research and

Donnelly: its correlation with other studies. I would hope that the University would be able some day to find the money to do a proper study on our students.

I think it is a problem everywhere and I don't mean to minimize it. I think that if we got back to the feeling of responsibility that you and I were talking about, this would become less of a problem. I'm not sure, though, that it is as great a problem as everybody thinks it is now. But I don't know because I haven't got any proper figures. I have only guesses from people who prefer to guess on the gloomy side.

Big Business and Too Many Experts

Before we finish this I should tell you about what I think is one of the major problems of University housing in the United States, not just at the University of California at Berkeley.

You will remember that in the early history which you and I talked about, I stressed the trouble we had persuading people to be interested in housing. We yearned to have people care about housing and to be interested. We particularly tried to be as eloquent as we could with all our bosses: the Regents, the presidents, the vice-presidents, and all the other decision-makers so that they would agree with us that housing was important.

Well, we have succeeded beyond our wildest dreams! We are now beset with "too many experts." We have become big business. We are not talking about borrowing $800,000 from our Regents to build housing for 470 students as we were in 1945. We are talking about millions (maybe billions) of dollars of housing in institutions of higher education. We are talking about federal loans. Architects become famous almost instantly because they

Donnelly: have designed "different" residence halls. Sociologists pine to investigate us. Psychologists want to tell us what to do.

We are living in a world in which almost everybody now has an idea about what should be done about housing. This problem is expressed in the conversations that I have with nearly every housing officer I know in the United States. We have, alas, become too popular. We have become so popular that no one wants to let us do our jobs, and everyone wants to tell us how to do them.

Nathan: It is almost as bad as being a ghetto resident. (Laughter)

Donnelly: I often think of that, as a matter of fact, when I listen to the ghetto residents (whatever a ghetto is or whoever they are) complain about being surveyed and analyzed and told what to do. I have a feeling that I should go to one of their meetings and say, "Please, let me join your club. I have problems, too."

We have developed a whole crew who, observing that other persons have become famous and rich by planning residence halls or writing stories about residence halls, want to get in on what is very obviously a very lucrative business. It is a little like all the research that has been done on what is known as the "Disturbances" at the University of California at Berkeley. I have read some of these papers or books and thought, "Where was that? It must be about a campus I don't know." Then I read on and find out that some "expert" is talking about the campus on which I have spent most of my working life and a large part of my life.

I don't know what we are going to do about this problem. The thing I hope for (and it is what all housing officers hope for) is that something else will get to be just as popular and just as

Donnelly: lucrative and as newsworthy as student housing. And then all of these experts, who really don't care whether it is student housing or something else that makes them famous, will go away.

This is not to say that there aren't some very able people who have contributed a great deal to the knowledge of the housing officers, because you could get tunnel vision in your preoccupation with your job. It is to say, however, that we are overwhelmed by the "experts."

The people who are most helpful to us are those who bother to find out what our problems, who bother to find out what the concerns are, who get thoroughly familiar with the situation, and then make suggestions. Some of the most useful suggestions have come from students who have said to themselves, "Why am I mad? What do I think the changes ought to be?" They have come often first with great tact, and then when their opinions were welcomed, with less tact and more forcefulness.

There are things which ought to be changed. Faculty members and even architects who have bothered to worry about what our problems were, have not only given us excellent advice but also information that we needed to have from somebody who was not concerned with the day to day operations. We all need to get some perspective on our growing and constantly changing situation; these people help.

It is to say, however, that we are all tired of the architect who doesn't ever criticize his fellow architect for flaws in the building, but criticizes us for ways in which we operate in the building created by his fellow architect. It is to say that we are tired of being run by architects (which unfortunately we still are) because they are the technicians who are going to build

Donnelly: the buildings and then go away. They are not ever going to feel that the things you said to which they didn't listen constitute problems in the buildings which they or one of their colleagues end up being critical of.

We are very unhappy about Mr. van der Ryn's "Dorms at Berkeley," which has had wide circulation. We do not think he bothered to find out what the problems were, and we do think that his "research" (which I rather like to use in quotes, because that is the way we feel about it), was done surreptitiously. The students in the halls did not wish to participate as a group in it. So he had students in one of his classes who went in and carried on the "research." This meant that 100 students out of 840 participated, on a personal basis. This seems to us manifestly unfair.

Sometimes I think I should carry on a similar poll of the students in the School of Architecture. There have been times when I have felt almost pressed to do so. And someday I may survey sociology and psychology classes too, with a carefully selected and prepared questionnaire and group of students.

All housing officers are acquainted with colleagues who remember what it was like at Harvard, and how delightful it was at Princeton 35 years ago. Of course it was, and of course they lived a happy and successful life. But it is a little hard to translate that into the lives of today's students of the University of California at Berkeley or any other present-day campus including Princeton and Harvard.

Then, of course, everyone is an expert on housing because it is a very personal matter. Nearly everyone can, and sometimes does, tell us how much better we could operate and what we ought to do to make the buildings better. All this, if it could be channeled

Donnelly: in some fashion which made sense, we would be grateful for.

I know only one or two housing officers out of the 500 or 600 whom I know in the United States, who really think they have all the answers, and those housing officers are not too popular with their colleagues. The rest of us are well aware that we are fallible. We are well aware that we behave as other human beings do, and that we can't possibly know all the things that need to be known.

Intelligent criticism and advice we welcome: people who first listen to us and then say, "I think you are wrong for these reasons." But outside criticism without any knowledge of the facts, takes up too much time we should be spending in more constructive ways.

I see no instant end to it. We are big business. The government is lending us money. It has all kinds of bureaucrats who are looking over our shoulders. They are telling us what to do. The banks, insurance companies, and our own bureaucrats who tell us what to do flourish. The only saving grace is that the students who complain, exhort, and exclaim also sometimes appreciate. And one grateful student balances out a so-called expert every time!

Nathan: That's very eloquent indeed. Is there anything else that you would like to say about the future of the enterprise or about your own views in addition to your ideas about giving responsibility back to the students? Are there some other thoughts that you have been working at?

Donnelly: There are a great many, none of them really very well formulated. And none of them are worth recording for posterity, I think.

Nathan: With that, I will thank you very much indeed. It's been a pleasure.

Donnelly: It has been fun. I have had a lovely time.

APPENDIX

Historical materials on file in the University Housing Office.
(To be used only in the office; additional materials are available on request.)

ANNUAL REPORTS
1947-1961
Relate to the growth and development of the Housing Office

DAVIS CAMPUS PILOT PROJECT

GILL TRACT HOUSING
Berkeley housing for married students

PLANNING COMMITTEE MATERIALS
For Units 1 and 2, and Unit 3
Records not complete

STATISTICS AND CHARTS
Housing information from 1947 to date, compiled yearly

SUBCOMMITTEES ON HOUSING
History and records

INDEX

ASUC, 4-6, 10
Associated Women Students, 38-39, 117-120

Bauer, Betty Kelly, 29
Bellquist, Imogene, 77
Blue and Gold, 5-6

Campbell, Vice Chancellor, 89
Clymer, Edith, 31

Daily Californian, 4-6, 8-10, 17
Davidson, Mrs. Mary, 7, 13, 19-52
Dean of University Housing, 103-126
Dean of Women's Office, 31-46
Deutsch, Dean Monroe, 12, 48, 51
Dewell, Margaret O., 68, 75, 76, 79, 89
Donnelly, John Bernard, 25

Faculty Wives' Housing Committee for Foreign Students, 77
Foorman, Carl, 29
Foreign students, 76-77

Hamilton, Rowena, 77
Harper, Lawrence, 28, 29
Heyns, Chancellor Roger, 37
Hitch, President Charles, 83
Hodges, Joe, 29
Honor students, 28, 29, 30, 31
Hoyt, Alice, 39, 40, 41, 43, 54

Jensen, Norman, 84
Journalism, School of, 8

Kelly, Betty (Mrs. Bauer), 29
Kerr, Chancellor Clark, 68, 69
Kerr, Mrs. Clark, 77
Koshland, Dan (Jr.), 29

Moffitt, J. K., 51, 52
Monahan, William, 68, 69
More, Anne, 79
Mortar Board, 7

Nedderson, Dick, 50, 88
Norton, Catherine Skinner, 1
Norton, Dan, 3
Norton, Lewis John, 1
Norton, William, 51, 52

People's Park, 114-115
Phi Beta Kappa, 28, 29

Prytanean, 7, 13, 20

Quire, Catharine, 27, 33, 35, 39-41, 43, 48, 52, 54

Raymond, Charlie, 8, 9, 10, 11
Regents, Board of
  student housing, 51, 52, 68

Sorority: Sigma Kappa, 13-19, 26, 27
Sorrick, Warde, 26, 27
Spiess, Noel, 29
Sproul, President Robert, 47-49, 51, 52, 66-75
Staff housing, 72
Stebbins, Miss Lucy, 7, 13, 27
Stern, Mrs. Sigmund, 57, 58
Student housing
  academic year contracts, 102
  administration, 48, 49, 72, 74, 87-92
  earthquake "stress and strain," 114
  foreign students, 76, 77
  inspection and housing committees, 19, 39, 40, 75
  married students
    Gill Tract, 61, 62
    Richmond, 67
  rent levels, 108-110
  residence halls
    building costs, 58
    co-educational halls, 94-96
    design competition, 59, 60, 85
    Fernwald, 51, 57, 58, 93
    financing, 80-84
    Manville Hall, 96-98, 110-114
    Smyth property, 53, 54, 57

Students
  behavior, 120
  rules, 92-94
  unrest (1966), 64, 65

Tribus, Myron, 29

UC Davis
  residence halls, 84
Underhill, Major __, 12
Underhill, Robert, 68
University Extension, 25-26

van der Ryn, Sim, 104, 124

Waithman, Victor, 29
Warnecke and Warnecke, 59, 60
Wells, Chauncey, 11, 12
Whipple, T. K., 11
Wilson, Scott, 66, 68, 69, 89
Witter, Jean, 51, 52
Wriston, Henry, 23-24

Harriet Siegel Nathan

Graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1941 with an A.B. in Journalism.
Was assistant women's editor and managing editor of The Daily Californian, then known as the Monarch of the College Dailies.
Prepared President Sproul's biennial report to the legislature, 1942-44; wrote advertising copy; edited house journals; served on local and state boards of the League of Women Voters, primarily in the fields of local and regional government and publications.
Returned to U.C. for a Master of Journalism degree in 1965.
Wrote for the University's Centennial Record.
Now doing research, writing, and editing for the Institute of Governmental Studies, U.C., Berkeley.

1 1858 -T